

A READER ON SOCIAL SCIENCES



PROGRESS PUBLISHERS
MOSCOW

АЗБУКА СОЦИАЛЬНО-ПОЛИТИЧЕСКИХ ЗНАНИЙ

ХРЕСТОМАТИЯ ПО ОБЩЕСТВОВЕДЕНИЮ

На английском языке

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

X 010100000-678 8-85
014 (01) -85

CONTENTS

To the Reader	7
SECTION I WHAT IS DIALECTICAL AND HISTORICAL MATERIALISM?	10
V. I. Lenin. <i>The Three Sources and Three Component Parts of Marxism</i>	13
K. Marx. From: <i>A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy</i> . Preface	22
From: <i>Marx to J. Weydermeyer, March 5, 1852</i>	26
K. Marx and F. Engels. Excerpt from: <i>The German Ideology</i> ..	29
F. Engels. Excerpt from <i>Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy</i>	34
F. Engels. Excerpt from <i>The Part Played by Labour in the Transition from Ape to Man</i> ..	39
F. Engels. Excerpt from: <i>The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State</i>	53
V. I. Lenin. Excerpt from: <i>What the "Friends of the People" Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats</i> ..	59
V. I. Lenin. Excerpt from: <i>Materialism and Empirio-Criticism</i>	64
V. I. Lenin. <i>The State</i> ..	73
V. I. Lenin. <i>Socialism and Religion</i>	94
V. I. Lenin. <i>The Tasks of the Youth Leagues</i> (From: Lenin's Speech to the Third All-Russia Congress of the Russian Young Communist League)	101
SECTION II WHAT IS POLITICAL ECONOMY?	108
K. Marx. From: <i>Capital</i>	111
K. Marx. From: <i>Wages, Price and Profit</i> ..	121
F. Engels. From: <i>Anti-Dühring</i> ..	140
V. I. Lenin. From: <i>Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism</i> ...	162
V. I. Lenin. From: <i>On the Slogan for a United States of Europe</i> ...	168
V. I. Lenin. From. the Original Version of the Article <i>The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government</i>	174
V. I. Lenin. From: "Left-Wing" Childishness and the Petty-Bourgeois Mentality	177
V. I. Lenin. From: <i>Economics and Politics in the Era of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat</i>	182
V. I. Lenin. From: <i>A Great Beginning</i>	189
V. I. Lenin. From. <i>On Co-Operation</i> ..	197

From: <i>The Basic Guidelines for Economic and Social Development of the USSR</i>	202
SECTION III. WHAT ARE SOCIALISM AND COMMUNISM?.....	214
K. Marx and F. Engels. From: <i>Manifesto of the Communist Party</i>	219
V. I. Lenin. <i>In Memory of the Commune</i>	247
V. I. Lenin. From: <i>The State and Revolution</i>	253
V. I. Lenin. <i>What Is Soviet Power?</i>	273
V. I. Lenin. <i>The Working Class and the National Question</i>	276
V. I. Lenin. <i>The Awakening of Asia</i>	279
From: <i>On the Centenary of the Birth of V. I. Lenin. Theses of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union</i>	282
From: <i>Tasks at the Present Stage of the Struggle Against Imperialism and United Action of the Communist and Workers' Parties and All Anti-Imperialist Forces</i> , a document adopted on June 17, by the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow	291
Extract from: <i>The Final Document For Peace, Security, Co-operation and Social Progress in Europe</i> , adopted unanimously by the Conference of European Communist and Workers' Parties in Berlin	303
Extract from: <i>Programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union</i>	320
From: <i>Constitution (Fundamental Law) of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics</i>	339
From: <i>Report of the Central Committee of the CPSU to the XXVIth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Immediate Tasks of the Party in Home and Foreign Policy</i>	364
Extract from: <i>The Report at a Joint Jubilee Meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, and the Supreme Soviet of the RSFSR in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses, December 21, in Celebration of the Sixtieth Anniversary of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics</i>	381
Yu. Andropov. <i>Karl Marx's Teaching and Some of the Problems in the Building of Socialism in the USSR</i>	395
Glossary	420
Name Index	459
Index of Literary and Mythological Heroes	463

To the Reader

The desire of students of social science for first-hand acquaintance with the works of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, the founders of scientific communism, and with those of Vladimir Lenin, the continuer of their revolutionary teachings and founder of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and of the Soviet state, is quite natural. Marx, Engels and Lenin are known worldwide as the creators of the proletariat's scientific outlook, designed not only to explain the world correctly, but to show the ways and means for changing it. They are also known as the working class' leaders, who have armed the international communist movement with the principles of revolutionary struggle.

Yet, to get first-hand acquaintance with the works of Marx, Engels and Lenin is no simple thing, since they constitute hundreds of volumes.

This *Reader on Social Sciences* is designed to help overcome the numerous difficulties involved in the study of the works by Marx, Engels and Lenin. It includes their major individual works or excerpts therefrom. It also contains documents of the Soviet state, the CPSU, and the international working-class movement, documents that have further developed the Marxist-Leninist doctrine to enrich it with new conclusions and tenets which sum up the experience of the world revolutionary working-class and liberation movements and the practice of building socialism and communism.

In the works and documents that follow, the reader will find answers to the basic questions posed before theoretical thought by the development of human society and the revolutionary movement, for example:

- What does the surrounding world essentially represent, and what is the role of man therein?
- What are the very general development laws of nature, society, and human thought?

— Why is the destruction of capitalism and triumph of communism inevitable?

— How can the peoples who have cast off the chains of colonial bondage attain economic and cultural prosperity?

— What are the ways for ridding mankind of the danger of extermination in a global thermonuclear war?

Marxism-Leninism consists of three interconnected parts: philosophy (dialectical and historical materialism), political economy, and scientific communism. Accordingly, this *Reader* comprises three sections, in which brief commentaries explain when and wherefore a given work was written, and how it helps understand Marxism-Leninism and apply it to present-day reality.

In order to facilitate reading on one's own, the *Reader* is supplied with a name index (containing information on people mentioned by Marx, Engels and Lenin) and a list of literary and mythological characters. It also includes a *Glossary*, which explains difficult terms in the works of the classics of Marxism-Leninism. The index, list, and glossary are compiled in alphabetical order.

We would like to give the following tips to beginners in the study of works by the founders of Marxism-Leninism. Marxism-Leninism is a truly scientific doctrine. Hence, like any science, it can be mastered only through diligent original study. In this book, the reader may come across certain tenets and passages difficult to understand. In this case, we advise him to continue reading, and what is vague from the outset will become understandable on second reading.

All the component parts of Marxism-Leninism are inseparably interconnected to form a single whole. It would be best to read them consecutively: first to study dialectical and historical materialism, then political economy, and finally scientific communism.

Marxism-Leninism is of international significance. Its internationally common tenets can be mastered easier on the basis of facts characteristic of the country or region of which the reader himself is a resident. Supposing some question is concerned with the colonial system of imperialism. In that case, it would be useful to examine how imperialist states (Britain, France, the United States, Portugal, Japan, etc.) had established and maintained their colonial rule in the countries

of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, a rule that met with severe rebuff from the enslaved peoples. The Marxist-Leninist doctrine shows the way for a revolutionary, national liberation struggle against imperialism, against the vestiges of colonialism and neo-colonialism, and the basic motive forces and short- and long-range objectives of that struggle. This is the only way to complete and final emancipation from oppression of one nation by another, the only way to establish equitable and just relations among all countries and peoples.

Naturally, the material included in the *Reader* far from fully exhausts the entirety of Marx's, Engels's and Lenin's scientific legacies, and it would appear advisable for the reader to follow up this book with a study of some of their major works in unabridged form.

Marx compared the study of social science with ascending a high mountain to give the following advice: "There is no royal road to science, and only those who do not dread the fatiguing climb of its steep paths have a chance of gaining its luminous summits".*

Section I

WHAT IS DIALECTICAL AND HISTORICAL MATERIALISM?

Man lives among men, in society, and everywhere he is surrounded by diverse, continually changing nature: land, rivers, forests, animals and many other things. People were always interested in learning the origin of nature and human society, and the essence of man and his place in the surrounding world.

Already 2,500 years ago, the first teachings on the surrounding world appeared in India, China, and Ancient Greece to be termed philosophy. Philosophy represents an integral totality of the most common views on the world, on the essence of being, and on human consciousness. Philosophy forms the foundation of human outlook.

Philosophers include two major groups, depending on how they answer the basic philosophical question of the relationship of consciousness to being, of the spiritual to the material, the question of whether nature and matter were created by the human mind or consciousness, or, on the contrary, the human mind or consciousness had originated from the development of nature, of the material world. Philosophers who regard as the starting point human consciousness, thought, and spirit are called idealists, while materialists are those who recognise nature, the material world as the basic source of existence.

Idealism and materialism are directly opposed to and irreconcilable with each other. Basically, every philosophical doctrine is either materialist or idealist.

Materialist views rest on the achievements of science in the study of nature and society, on mankind's practical experience. Numerous centuries have witnessed the arisal of various types of materialism which improved along with the development of science. As a rule, materialism is the outlook of progressive social forces.

Contrariwise, idealism distorts the world by declaring it unreal; in effect, idealism contradicts science and practice to

usually serve reactionaries in their struggle against everything progressive. For exploiters, idealism has always been an instrument of spiritual enslavement of the working people, a means for justifying and consolidating their domination. For example, idealists explain the actually existing contradictions and vices of capitalist society by human delusions and imperfect morals. Yet, one cannot change the capitalist system by simply eliminating these delusions and moral imperfections. By sidetracking a true solution of this issue, and by leading others away from that, idealists help eternalise the exploiter capitalist system.

Marxist philosophical materialism represents the acme of philosophical thought. Marx and Engels critically analysed the results of all previous philosophies to theoretically sum up the achievements of the natural science of their time. They combined the materialist doctrine with the dialectical method (a method of scientific cognition that regards reality in its development and contradictions) to create a totally new philosophy, dialectical materialism, which reveals the universal laws of the development of nature, society and human thought.

Marx and Engels spread the tenets of dialectical materialism to the study of the development of human society and created a new philosophical doctrine, historical materialism, a major gain of scientific thought. This new philosophical doctrine allowed to discover the laws of social development that are independent of people's consciousness and will, thereby making it possible to scientifically foresee the future of humankind.

The creation by Marx and Engels of dialectical and historical materialism was a real revolution in the development of philosophical knowledge. This doctrine is, in effect, a powerful spiritual weapon of the proletariat, of all the working people in their struggle for social emancipation. It affords a true picture of the universe, arms mankind with the laws that govern its changes, and permits to make the revolutionary struggle of the working class conscientious, purposeful, and most successful.

Lenin broadened the Marxist philosophical doctrine in the new historical era. He resolutely defended it from attempts by bourgeois ideologists and opportunists do distort and revise it

Having creatively developed dialectical and historical materialism, Lenin elucidated the ways for the onward march of human society in the 20th century.

Marx, Engels and Lenin expounded their philosophical doctrine, viz. dialectical and historical materialism, in numerous works. In studying Marxist-Leninist philosophy, it is important to bear the following factors in mind. To master that philosophy does not simply mean to memorise its tenets and conclusions. The most important thing is to deeply understand their essence and to learn to creatively apply them in practice with consideration for specific historical conditions of social development.

V. I. Lenin

THE THREE SOURCES AND THREE COMPONENT PARTS OF MARXISM

Lenin wrote this article in 1913 in commemoration of the thirtieth anniversary of Marx's death. He briefly characterised the major revolution achieved by Marxism in human cognition and in science to show the historical roots, essence, and structure of the Marxist doctrine.

As a scientific outlook, Marxism arose and developed in an acute and irreconcilable struggle with bourgeois ideology. Bourgeois theoreticians slanderously asserted that Marxism was allegedly an exclusive doctrine which had originated aside the high road of human civilisation. However, Lenin showed that Marx's and Engels' doctrine had actually imbibed all the best features of the 19th-century social thought, primarily those of classical German philosophy, British bourgeois political economy, and French utopian socialism, the three theoretical sources of Marxism which he pointed out in his article.

The first section of the article speaks of the best features which Marx and Engels had critically assimilated from classical German philosophy, namely of the basic tenets of Feuerbach's materialism and the scientific aspects of Hegel's teaching on dialectics. Proceeding from these sources, and having further developed them, Marx and Engels created a qualitatively new scientific philosophy, viz. dialectical and historical materialism.

The second section examines the essence of the Marxist economic doctrine. It had assimilated the achievements of classical English political economy, particularly the labour theory of value (which infers that commodity value is created by the social work of commodity producers) developed by Adam Smith and David Ricardo. Marx further developed the theory of value to show for the first time that the relationships developing between commodities during their exchange in the market should be seen as economic relations between people. In his principal work, *Capital*, Marx

completed a deep and comprehensive study of the economic relations between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. In Lenin's judgement, the cornerstone of Marxist political economy is Marx's theory of surplus value, the theory that pinpointed the source of capitalist enrichment. The irreconcilable capitalist contradictions exposed on the basis of that theory, and the proletariat's class struggle against the bourgeoisie, ultimately lead to inevitable revolutionary replacement of capitalist society by communist society.

In the last section of his article, Lenin showed that the theoretical sources of Marxist scientific socialism were the doctrines of the French utopian socialists Saint-Simon and Fourier. At the same time, however, Marx and Engels revealed the fundamental shortcoming of those teachings, namely their inability to show the workers a real way out of 'capitalist hired servitude. In Lenin's words, Marx's and Engels' greatest merit lies in the fact that they had turned socialism from an utopia (a dream about an ideal social system) into a science. They singled out the proletariat as the social force capable of creating a new communist society. In their doctrine of the class struggle, Marx and Engels had, for the first time, answered the basic question as to how the proletariat could exterminate exploitation of man by man, oppression of one nation by another, so as to create a society of social justice, communism.

Lenin's article helps to correctly approach the study of Marxist views. Marxism cannot be mastered simply by random consideration of its component parts (dialectical and historical materialism, political economy, and scientific communism). All of them are inseparably interconnected, and together form an integral world outlook. This is something that all those starting to study the Marxist doctrine should remember from the very outset.

It is also important to regard Marxism as a developing scientific teaching which is being enriched by new conclusions and tenets on the basis of the sum total of the most up-to-date scientific achievements, experience of the world revolutionary working-class and liberation movements, and practice of socialist and communist construction in the USSR and other socialist countries.

An outstanding contribution to Marxism was made by

Lenin, who raised this revolutionary doctrine to a new, higher level to creatively develop and concretise it in a new historical epoch. Lenin supplemented and enriched all the component parts of Marxism, and his great contribution to the latter has come to be called Leninism. "Leninism is the Marxism of the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, the epoch of the collapse of colonialism and the victory of national-liberation movements, the epoch of mankind's transition from capitalism to socialism and the building of communist society."* Hence, the working class' scientific world outlook is called Marxism-Leninism.

Throughout the civilised world the teachings of Marx evoke the utmost hostility and hatred of all bourgeois science (both official and liberal), which regards Marxism as a kind of "pernicious sect". And no other attitude is to be expected, for there can be no "impartial" social science in a society based on class struggle. In one way or another, *all* official and liberal science *defends* wage-slavery, whereas Marxism has declared relentless war on that slavery. To expect science to be impartial in a wage-slave society is as foolishly naive as to expect impartiality from manufacturers on the question of whether workers' wages ought not to be increased by decreasing the profits of capital.

But this is not all. The history of philosophy and the history of social science show with perfect clarity that there is nothing resembling "sectarianism" in Marxism, in the sense of its being a hidebound, petrified doctrine, a doctrine which arose *away from* the high road of the development of world civilisation. On the contrary, the genius of Marx consists precisely in his having furnished answers to questions already raised by the foremost minds of mankind. His doctrine emerged as the direct and immediate *continuation* of the teachings of the greatest representatives of philosophy, political economy and socialism.

The Marxist doctrine is omnipotent because it is true. It is comprehensive and harmonious, and provides men with an integral world outlook irreconcilable with any form of superstition, reaction, or defence of bourgeois oppression. It is the legitimate successor to the best that man produced in the nineteenth century, as represented by German philosophy, English political economy and French socialism.

It is these three sources of Marxism, which are also its component parts that we shall outline in brief.

The philosophy of Marxism is *materialism*. Throughout the modern history of Europe, and especially at the end of the eighteenth century in France, where a resolute struggle was conducted against every kind of medieval rubbish, against serfdom in institutions and ideas, materialism has proved to be the only philosophy that is consistent, true to all the teachings of natural science and hostile to superstition, cant and so forth. The enemies of democracy have, therefore, always exerted all their efforts to "refute", undermine and defame materialism, and have advocated various forms of philosophical idealism, which always, in one way or another, amounts to the defence or support of religion.

Marx and Engels defended philosophical materialism in the most determined manner and repeatedly explained how profoundly erroneous is every deviation from this basis. Their views are most clearly and fully expounded in the works of Engels, *Ludwig Feuerbach* and *Anti-Dühring*, which, like the *Communist Manifesto*, are handbooks for every class-conscious worker.

But Marx did not stop at eighteenth-century materialism: he developed philosophy to a higher level. He enriched it with the achievements of German classical philosophy, especially of Hegel's system, which in its turn had led to the materialism of Feuerbach. The main achievement was *dialectics*, i.e., the doctrine of development in its fullest, deepest and most comprehensive form, the doctrine of the relativity of the human knowledge that provides us with a reflection of eternally developing matter. The latest discoveries of natural science—radium, electrons, the transmutation of elements—have been a remarkable confirmation of Marx's dialectical materialism despite the teachings of the bourgeois philosophers with their "new" reverions to old and decadent idealism.

Marx deepened and developed philosophical materialism to the full, and extended the cognition of nature to include the cognition of *human society*. His *historical materialism* was a great achievement in scientific thinking. The chaos and arbitrariness that had previously reigned in views on history and politics were replaced by a strikingly integral and

harmonious scientific theory, which shows how, in consequence of the growth of productive forces, out of one system of social life another and higher system develops—how capitalism, for instance, grows out of feudalism.

Just as man's knowledge reflects nature (i.e., developing matter), which exists independently of him, so man's *social knowledge* (i.e., his various views and doctrines—philosophical, religious, political and so forth) reflects the *economic system* of society. Political institutions are a superstructure on the economic foundation. We see, for example, that the various political forms of the modern European states serve to strengthen the domination of the bourgeoisie over the proletariat.

Marx's philosophy is a consummate philosophical materialism which has provided mankind, and especially the working class, with powerful instruments of knowledge.

II

Having recognised that the economic system is the foundation on which the political superstructure is erected, Marx devoted his greatest attention to the study of this economic system. Marx's principal work, *Capital*, is devoted to a study of the economic system of modern, i.e., capitalist society.

Classical political economy, before Marx, evolved in England, the most developed of the capitalist countries. Adam Smith and David Ricardo, by their investigations of the economic system, laid the foundations of the *labour theory of value*. Marx continued their work; he provided a proof of the theory and developed it consistently. He showed that the value of every commodity is determined by the quantity of socially necessary labour time spent on its production.

Where the bourgeois economists saw a relation between things (the exchange of one commodity for another) Marx revealed a *relation between people*. The exchange of commodities expresses the connection between individual producers through the market. *Money* signifies that the connection is becoming closer and closer, inseparably uniting the entire economic life of the individual producers into the whole. *Capital* signifies a further development of this connection: man's labour-power becomes a commodity. The wage-worker

sells his labour-power to the owner of land, factories and instruments of labour. The worker spends one part of the day covering the cost of maintaining himself and his family (wages), while the other part of the day he works without remuneration, creating for the capitalist *surplus-value*, the source of profit, the source of the wealth of the capitalist class.

The doctrine of surplus-value is the corner-stone of Marx's economic theory.

Capital, created by the labour of the worker, crushes the worker, ruining small proprietors and creating an army of unemployed. In industry, the victory of large-scale production is immediately apparent, but the same phenomenon is also to be observed in agriculture, where the superiority of large-scale capitalist agriculture is enhanced, the use of machinery increases and the peasant economy, trapped by money-capital, declines and falls into ruin under the burden of its backward technique. The decline of small-scale production assumes different forms in agriculture, but the decline itself is an indisputable fact.

By destroying small-scale production, capital leads to an increase in productivity of labour and to the creation of a monopoly position for the associations of big capitalists. Production itself becomes more and more social—hundreds of thousands and millions of workers become bound together in a regular economic organism—but the product of this collective labour is appropriated by a handful of capitalists. Anarchy of production, crises, the furious chase after markets and the insecurity of existence of the mass of the population are intensified.

By increasing the dependence of the workers on capital, the capitalist system creates the great power of united labour.

Marx traced the development of capitalism from embryonic commodity economy, from simple exchange, to its highest forms, to large-scale production.

And the experience of all capitalist countries, old and new, year by year demonstrates clearly the truth of this Marxian doctrine to increasing numbers of workers.

Capitalism has triumphed all over the world, but this triumph is only the prelude to the triumph of labour over capital.

III

When feudalism was overthrown and "free" capitalist society appeared in the world, it at once became apparent that this freedom meant a new system of oppression and exploitation of the working people. Various socialist doctrines immediately emerged as a reflection of and protest against this oppression. Early socialism, however, was *utopian* socialism. It criticised capitalist society, it condemned and damned it, it dreamed of its destruction, it had visions of a better order and endeavoured to convince the rich of the immorality of exploitation.

But utopian socialism could not indicate the real solution. It could not explain the real nature of wage-slavery under capitalism, it could not reveal the laws of capitalist development, or show what *social force* is capable of becoming the creator of a new society.

Meanwhile, the stormy revolutions which everywhere in Europe, and especially in France, accompanied the fall of feudalism, of serfdom, more and more clearly revealed the *struggle of classes* as the basis and the driving force of all development.

Not a single victory of political freedom over the feudal class was won except against desperate resistance. Not a single capitalist country evolved on a more or less free and democratic basis except by a life-and-death struggle between the various classes of capitalist society.

The genius of Marx lies in his having been the first to deduce from this the lesson world history teaches and to apply that lesson consistently. The deduction he made is the doctrine of the *class struggle*.

People always have been the foolish victims of deception and self-deception in politics, and they always will be until they have learnt to seek out the *interests* of some class or other behind all moral, religious, political and social phrases, declarations and promises. Champions of reforms and improvements will always be fooled by the defenders of the old order until they realise that every old institution, however barbarous and rotten it may appear to be, is kept going by the forces of certain ruling classes. And there is *only one way* of smashing the resistance of those classes, and that is to find, in

the very society which surrounds us, the forces which can—and, owing to their social position, *must*—constitute the power capable of sweeping away the old and creating the new, and to enlighten and organise those forces for the struggle.

Marx's philosophical materialism alone has shown the proletariat the way out of the spiritual slavery in which all oppressed classes have hitherto languished. Marx's economic theory alone has explained the true position of the proletariat in the general system of capitalism.

Independent organisations of the proletariat are multiplying all over the world, from America to Japan and from Sweden to South Africa. The proletariat is becoming enlightened and educated by waging its class struggle; it is ridding itself of the prejudices of bourgeois society; it is rallying its ranks ever more closely and is learning to gauge the measure of its successes; it is steeling its forces and is growing irresistibly.



Karl Marx

From: A CONTRIBUTION TO THE CRITIQUE OF POLITICAL ECONOMY

PREFACE

Marx partially published his work in 1859. Later, a revised version of its main tenets was included in his principal work, *Capital*. Marx deals in it with the fundamentals of his doctrine on commodity production in capitalist economy to diatribe bourgeois political economy.

In the *Preface* (most of which is cited below), Marx briefly outlined the essence of materialist understanding of history. His merit lies primarily in the fact that he elucidated the role of production relations in the life of society. These relations are always established between people who jointly manufacture the means of production and consumer goods. Production relations are indicative of what social class owns the means of production, and what groups are deprived of that ownership. They also show how and in whose interests people distribute and exchange products. Marx called the totality of material, i.e., economic, production relations the *basis* of society.

Marx was also the first to establish that all other human relationships, or the so-called social "superstructure", essentially depend on the economic basis. The said superstructure includes political relations (which show to whom state power belongs); legal relations (which manifest the rules and laws of civil behaviour); moral, aesthetic, and religious relations; and also the views and ideas prevalent in society.

For example, in the United States, Britain, France, and Japan, the owners of production facilities are capitalists, who hold power in the whole of society. Their dominance is supported by the state (through the army and police), legal institutions (the Procurator's Office and the Court), and the mass media (newspapers, radio, television).

In the *Preface*, Marx singled out the most deep-lying cause of human social development to progress. It is, in effect, in the continuous improvement of productive forces with the help of which all the things and means of livelihood are created. To begin with, people perfect their instruments of

labour (for instance, replace simple manual implements by increasingly sophisticated machinery), and when new productive forces appear in society, the previously established production relations eventually cease to correspond to the former. In the course of a social revolution, old production relations are replaced by new ones, and the superstructure of the economic basis of society changes accordingly.

The laws of social development discovered by Marx play an important role in understanding modern history. They help understand why in an increasing number of countries the capitalist system is being replaced by the socialist system. The point is that way back in the 19th century capitalism gave a powerful impetus to the development of new productive forces—large-scale mechanical production (factories, plants involving the use of mechanisms), which in the 20th century has grown to extremely big proportions. These factories and plants can manufacture so many products that with time they could provide complete welfare to all members of society. Consequently, material conditions have been created to enable mankind rid itself once and for all of exploitation of man by man, of oppression of one nation by another. Hence Marx's conclusion: the bourgeois society is the last exploiter system in history which inevitably will be superseded by one of social equality and justice, by a socialist system.

The general conclusion at which I arrived and which, once reached, became the guiding principle of my studies can be summarised as follows. In the social production of their existence, men inevitably enter into definite relations, which are independent of their will, namely relations of production appropriate to a given stage in the development of their material forces of production. The totality of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation, on which arises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production of material life conditions the general process of social, political and intellectual life. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but their social existence that determines their consciousness. At a certain stage of development, the material productive forces of society come into conflict with the existing relations of production or—this merely expresses the same thing in legal terms—with the property relations within the framework of which they have operated hitherto. From forms of development of the productive forces these relations turn into their fetters. Then begins an era of social revolution. The changes in the economic foundation lead sooner or later to the transformation of the whole immense superstructure. In studying such transformations it is always necessary to distinguish between the material transformation of the economic conditions of production, which can be determined with the precision of natural science, and the legal, political, religious, artistic or philosophic—in short, ideological forms in which men become conscious of this conflict and fight it out. Just as one does not judge an individual by what he thinks about himself, so one cannot judge such a period of transformation by its consciousness, but, on the contrary, this consciousness must be explained from the contradictions of material life, from the conflict existing between the social

forces of production and the relations of production. No social order is ever destroyed before all the productive forces for which it is sufficient have been developed, and new superior relations of production never replace older ones before the material conditions for their existence have matured within the framework of the old society. Mankind thus inevitably sets itself only such tasks as it is able to solve, since closer examination will always show that the problem itself arises only when the material conditions for its solution are already present or at least in the course of formation. In broad outline, the Asiatic, ancient, feudal and modern bourgeois modes of production may be designated as epochs marking progress in the economic development of society. The bourgeois mode of production is the last antagonistic form of the social process of production—antagonistic not in the sense of individual antagonism but of an antagonism that emanates from the individuals' social conditions of existence—but the productive forces developing within bourgeois society create also the material conditions for a solution of this antagonism. The prehistory of human society accordingly closes with this social formation.

From: MARX TO J. WEYDERMEYER,
March 5, 1852

Given below is the main contents of Marx's letter to J. Weydermeyer. The letter briefly explains the essence of Marx's doctrine on the struggle of classes, large groups of people distinguished chiefly by their status in production.

Before Marx, in the late 18th and early 19th centuries, French and British economists wrote about factors that discriminate classes (by their incomes). In the first half of the 19th century, French historians spoke of the bourgeoisie's class struggle against the feudals.

For the first time, Marx provided answers to major questions which his predecessors had failed to resolve. The first question was why different classes had existed throughout history. In answering it, Marx showed the role of material conditions of production and of private property in the division of society into classes. Throughout human history, the material methods for providing livelihood and corresponding types of private ownership of the means of production (land, implements of labour, etc.) had repeatedly changed, and this led to replacement of one dominant social class by another.

Historically, under slave-ownership, society was divided into slave-owners and slaves; under feudalism, into feudal lords and peasants dependent on them; under capitalism, into the bourgeoisie and the workers. The slave-owner, feudal, and capitalist classes were the proprietors of the material means of production, while slaves, feudal-dependent peasants, and workers were those whose labour enriched their masters. The interests of all these classes were naturally opposed and irreconcilable. Hence, all three societies were characterised by a struggle, which in the end led to the dominance of a new class.

Marx was the first to scientifically predict the outcome of the class struggle of the workers against the bourgeoisie, and when a classless society would arise. His science-based

prevision is presently being implemented in socialist countries, where the rule of the bourgeoisie has been overthrown and a system of state power serving the interests of all the working people established. In socialist countries, all citizens and nations are free of all oppression, and voluntarily co-operate in joint labour for the benefit of all. The socialist state creates the necessary conditions for a future transition to a classless society of complete social equality.

And how as to myself, no credit is due to me for discovering the existence of classes in modern society or the struggle between them. Long before me bourgeois historians had described the historical development of this class struggle and bourgeois economists the economic anatomy of the classes. What I did that was new was to prove: 1) that the *existence of classes* is only bound up with *particular historical phases in the development of production*, 2) that the class struggle necessarily leads to *the dictatorship of the proletariat*, 3) that this dictatorship itself only constitutes the transition to the *abolition of all classes* and to a *classless society*.

Karl Marx and Frederick Engels

Excerpt from: THE GERMAN IDEOLOGY

The German Ideology. A Critique of Modern German Philosophy Represented by L. Feuerbach, B. Bauer, and M. Stirner, and by various Prophets of German Socialism (Manuscript written in 1845-1846).

In this work, Marx and Engels for the first time developed an integral doctrine embodying a materialist understanding of history, i.e., historical materialism. It consists of two volumes. The first one is devoted to a critique of idealism of the Young Hegelians, philosophers who proceeded from the teaching of German idealist Hegel, but who opposed the religious tenets of his doctrine to emphasise the role of the individual factor in history. The second volume is devoted to a critique of the German petty-bourgeois "true socialism", whose representatives advocated universal love and fraternity as means for transforming society on socialist principles, and rejected political struggle.

Cited below is an excerpt from the first chapter of the first volume of *The German Ideology*. In it, Marx and Engels specified the premises for a materialistic understanding of history, namely individuals, their activity and living conditions. Human activity has two aspects, viz. production (relation of people to nature) and intercourse (relationships between people). Production and intercourse mutually condition one another; but production is the determining factor. In *The German Ideology*, Marx and Engels comprehensively developed and substantiated the major tenet of historical materialism, namely the decisive role of material production in the life of society.

The premises from which we begin are not arbitrary ones, not dogmas, but real premises from which abstraction can only be made in the imagination. They are the real individuals, their activity and the material conditions of their life, both those which they find already existing and those produced by their activity. These premises can thus be verified in a purely empirical way.

The first premise of all human history is, of course, the existence of living human individuals. Thus the first fact to be established is the physical organisation of these individuals and their consequent relation to the rest of nature. Of course, we cannot here go either into the actual physical nature of man, or into the natural conditions in which man finds himself—geological, oro-hydrographical, climatic and so on. All historical writing must set out from these natural bases and their modification in the course of history through the action of men.

Men can be distinguished from animals by consciousness, by religion or anything else you like. They themselves begin to distinguish themselves from animals as soon as they begin to *produce* their means of subsistence, a step which is conditioned by their physical organisation. By producing their means of subsistence men are indirectly producing their material life.

The way in which men produce their means of subsistence depends first of all on the nature of the means of subsistence they actually find in existence and have to reproduce.

This mode of production must not be considered simply as being the reproduction of the physical existence of the individuals. Rather it is a definite form of activity of these individuals, a definite form of expressing their life, a definite *mode of life* on their part. As individuals express their life, so they are. What they are, therefore, coincides with their production, both with *what* they produce and with *how* they

produce. Hence what individuals are depends on the material conditions of their production.

This production only makes its appearance with the *increase of population*. In its turn this presupposes the *intercourse* [*Verkehr*] of individuals with one another. The form of this intercourse is again determined by production.

The relations of different nations among themselves depend upon the extent to which each has developed its productive forces, the division of labour and internal intercourse. This proposition is generally recognised. But not only the relation of one nation to others, but also the whole internal structure of the nation itself depends on the stage of development reached by its production and its internal and external intercourse. How far the productive forces of a nation are developed is shown most manifestly by the degree to which the division of labour has been carried. Each new productive force, insofar as it is not merely a quantitative extension of productive forces already known (for instance, the bringing into cultivation of fresh land), causes a further development of the division of labour.

The division of labour inside a nation leads at first to the separation of industrial and commercial from agricultural labour, and hence to the separation of *town* and *country* and to the conflict of their interests. Its further development leads to the separation of commercial from industrial labour. At the same time through the division of labour inside these various branches there develop various divisions among the individuals co-operating in definite kinds of labour. The relative position of these individual groups is determined by the way work is organised in agriculture, industry and commerce (patriarchalism, slavery, estates, classes). These same conditions are to be seen (given a more developed intercourse) in the relations of different nations to one another.

The various stages of development in the division of labour are just so many different forms of property, i.e., the existing stage in the division of labour determines also the relation of individuals to one another with reference to the material, instrument and product of labour.

* * *

Since we are dealing with the Germans, who are devoid of premises, we must begin by stating the first premise of all human existence and, therefore, of all history, the premise, namely, that men must be in a position to live in order to be able to "make history". But life involves before everything else eating and drinking, housing, clothing and various other things. The first historical act is thus the production of the means to satisfy these needs, the production of material life itself. And indeed this is an historical act, a fundamental condition of all history, which today, as thousands of years ago, must daily and hourly be fulfilled merely in order to sustain human life.

The second point is that the satisfaction of the first need, the action of satisfying and the instrument of satisfaction which has been acquired, leads to new needs: and this creation of new needs is the first historical act. Here we recognise immediately the spiritual ancestry of the great historical wisdom of the Germans who, when they run out of positive material and when they can serve up neither theological nor political nor literary rubbish, assert that this is not history at all, but the "prehistoric age". They do not, however, enlighten us as to how we proceed from this nonsensical "prehistory" to history proper; although, on the other hand, in their historical speculation they seize upon this "prehistory" with especial eagerness because they imagine themselves safe there from interference on the part of "crude facts", and, at the same time, because there they can give full rein to their speculative impulse and set up and knock down hypotheses by the thousand.

The third circumstance which, from the very outset, enters into historical development, is that men, who daily re-create their own life, begin to make other men, to propagate their kind: the relation between man and woman, parents and children, the *family*. The family, which to begin with is the only social relation, becomes later, when increased needs create new social relations and the increased population new needs, a subordinate one (except in Germany), and must then be treated and analysed according to the existing empirical data, not according to "the concept of the family", as is the custom in Germany.

These three aspects of social activity are not of course to be taken as three different stages, but just as three aspects or, to make it clear to the Germans, three "moments", which have existed simultaneously since the dawn of history and the first men, and which still assert themselves in history today.

The production of life, both of one's own in labour and of fresh life in procreation, now appears as a twofold relation: on the one hand as a natural, on the other as a social relation—social in the sense that it denotes the co-operation of several individuals, no matter under what conditions, in what manner and to what end. It follows from this that a certain mode of production, or industrial stage, is always combined with a certain mode of co-operation, or social stage, and this mode of co-operation, is itself a "productive force". Further, that the aggregate of productive forces accessible to men determines the condition of society, hence, the "history of humanity" must always be studied and treated in relation to the history of industry and exchange.

Frederick Engels

Excerpt from: LUDWIG FEUERBACH AND THE END OF CLASSICAL GERMAN PHILOSOPHY

This work was written in 1886. Its four chapters show the origin and essence of the Marxist world outlook; the foundations of dialectical and historical materialism; and the Marxist attitude towards philosophical predecessors of Marxism, Feuerbach and Hegel, who were major representatives of classical German philosophy.

Cited below is a small excerpt from Chapter 2, which permits to clearly understand the basic question of philosophy, the relation of thought to being, of intellect to nature, and the difference between materialism and idealism.

Engels's work is also important for clarifying the question whether or not man can cognize the world. In giving an affirmative reply, Engels alludes to the fact that physics, chemistry, astronomy, and other sciences afford reliable evidence on nature. People always verify and establish the truth of their ideas through practice.

Over the years, all the natural and social sciences have increasingly corroborated the correctness of Marxist philosophical views.

The great basic question of all philosophy, especially of more recent philosophy, is that concerning the relation of thinking and being. From the very early times when men, still completely ignorant of the structure of their own bodies, under the stimulus of dream apparitions* came to believe that their thinking and sensation were not activities of their bodies, but of a distinct soul which inhabits the body and leaves it at death—from this time men have been driven to reflect about the relation between this soul and the outside world. If upon death it took leave of the body and lived on, there was no occasion to invent yet another distinct death for it. Thus arose the idea of its immortality, which at that stage of development appeared not at all as a consolation but as a fate against which it was no use fighting, and often enough, as among the Greeks, as a positive misfortune. Not religious desire for consolation, but the quandary arising from the common universal ignorance of what to do with this soul, once its existence had been accepted, after the death of the body, led in a general way to the tedious notion of personal immortality. In an exactly similar manner the first gods arose through the personification of natural forces. And these gods in the further development of religions assumed more and more an extramundane form, until finally by a process of abstraction, I might almost say of distillation, occurring naturally in the course of man's intellectual development, out of the many more or less limited and mutually limiting gods there arose in the minds of men the idea of the one exclusive God of the monotheistic religions.

* Among savages and lower barbarians the idea is still universal that the human forms which appear in dreams are souls which have temporarily left their bodies; the real man is, therefore, held responsible for acts committed by his dream apparition against the dreamer. Thus Im Thurn found this belief current, for example, among the Indians of Guiana in 1884. (*Note by Engels.*)

Thus the question of the relation of thinking to being, the relation of the spirit to nature—the paramount question of the whole of philosophy—has, no less than all religion, its roots in the narrow-minded and ignorant notions of savagery. But this question could for the first time be put forward in its whole acuteness, could achieve its full significance, only after humanity in Europe had awakened from the long hibernation of the Christian Middle Ages. The question of the position of thinking in relation to being, a question which, by the way, had played a great part also in the scholasticism of the Middle Ages, the question: which is primary, spirit or nature—that question, in relation to the church, was sharpened into this: Did God create the world or has the world been in existence eternally?

The answers which the philosophers gave to this question split them into two great camps. Those who asserted the primacy of spirit to nature and, therefore, in the last instance, assumed world creation in some form or other—and among the philosophers, Hegel, for example, this creation often becomes still more intricate and impossible than in Christianity—comprised the camp of idealism. The others, who regarded nature as primary, belong to the various schools of materialism.

These two expressions, idealism and materialism, originally signify nothing else but this; and here too they are not used in any other sense. What confusion arises when some other meaning is put into them will be seen below.

But the question of the relation of thinking and being has yet another side: in what relation do our thoughts about the world surrounding us stand to this world itself? Is our thinking capable of the cognition of the real world? Are we able in our ideas and notions of the real world to produce a correct reflection of reality? In philosophical language this question is called the question of the identity of thinking and being, and the overwhelming majority of philosophers give an affirmative answer to this question. With Hegel, for example, its affirmation is self-evident; for what we cognise in the real world is precisely its thought-content—that which makes the world a gradual realisation of the absolute idea, which absolute idea has existed somewhere from eternity, independent of the world and before the world. But it is manifest

without further proof that thought can know a content which is from the outset a thought-content. It is equally manifest that what is to be proved here is already tacitly contained in the premise. But that in no way prevents Hegel from drawing the further conclusion from his proof of the identity of thinking and being that his philosophy, because it is correct for his thinking, is therefore the only correct one, and that the identity of thinking and being must prove its validity by mankind immediately translating his philosophy from theory into practice and transforming the whole world according to Hegelian principles. This is an illusion which he shares with well-nigh all philosophers.

In addition there is yet a set of different philosophers—those who question the possibility of any cognition, or at least of an exhaustive cognition, of the world. To them, among the more modern ones, belong Hume and Kant, and they have played a very important role in philosophical development. What is decisive in the refutation of this view has already been said by Hegel, in so far as this was possible from an idealist standpoint. The materialistic additions made by Feuerbach are more ingenious than profound. The most telling refutation of this as of all other philosophical crotchets is practice, namely, experiment and industry. If we are able to prove the correctness of our conception of a natural process by making it ourselves, bringing it into being out of its conditions and making it serve our own purposes into the bargain, then there is an end to the Kantian ungraspable "thing-in-itself". The chemical substances produced in the bodies of plants and animals remained just such "things-in-themselves" until organic chemistry began to produce them one after another, whereupon the "thing-in-itself" became a thing for us, as, for instance, alizarin, the colouring matter of the madder, which we no longer trouble to grow in the madder roots in the field, but produce much more cheaply and simply from coal tar. For three hundred years the Copernican solar system was a hypothesis with a hundred, a thousand or ten thousand chances to one in its favour, but still always a hypothesis. But when Leverrier, by means of the data provided by this system, not only deduced the necessity of the existence of an unknown planet, but also calculated the position in the heavens which this planet must

necessarily occupy, and when Galle really found this planet, the Copernican system was proved. If, nevertheless, the Neo-Kantians are attempting to resurrect the Kantian conception in Germany and the agnostics that of Hume in England (where in fact it never became extinct), this is, in view of their theoretical and practical refutation accomplished long ago, scientifically a regression and practically merely a shamefaced way of surreptitiously accepting materialism, while denying it before the world.

Frederick Engels

Excerpt from: THE PART PLAYED BY LABOUR IN THE TRANSITION FROM APE TO MAN

Engels published this article in 1876 to develop and enrich a materialist understanding of one of mankind's chief enigmas, namely the time and ways of man's origin on earth.

Engels deserves major credit for philosophically summarising the numerous achievements of the natural and social sciences. By doing this, he convincingly showed the outstanding role of labour, which is in fact purposeful activity for providing the means of living, in the evolution of man from the animal kingdom. At the same time, he emphasised the significance of manufacturing implements of labour (first the very simple stone knives and axes and subsequently sophisticated machines) for rapid development of human abilities.

Today, the newest evidence provided by the natural and social sciences fully confirms the basic tenets of Engels's article. In our time, too, human labour in material production plays a leading role in the life of society.

Labour is the source of all wealth, the political economists assert. And it really is the source—next to nature, which supplies it with the material that it converts into wealth. But it is even infinitely more than this. It is the prime basic condition for all human existence, and this to such an extent that, in a sense, we have to say that labour created man himself.

Many hundreds of thousands of years ago, during an epoch, not yet definitely determinable, of that period of the earth's history known to geologists as the Tertiary period, most likely towards the end of it, a particularly highly-developed race of anthropoid apes lived somewhere in the tropical zone—probably on a great continent that has now sunk to the bottom of the Indian Ocean. Darwin has given us an approximate description of these ancestors of ours. They were completely covered with hair, they had beards and pointed ears, and they lived in bands in the trees.

Climbing assigns different functions to the hands and the feet, and when their mode of life involved locomotion on level ground, these apes gradually got out of the habit of using their hands [in walking—*Tr.*] and adopted a more and more erect posture. This was the decisive step in *the transition from ape to man*.

All extant anthropoid apes can stand erect and move about on their feet alone, but only in case of urgent need and in a very clumsy way. Their natural gait is in a half-erect posture and includes the use of the hands. The majority rest the knuckles of the fist on the ground and, with legs drawn up, swing the body through their long arms, much as a cripple moves on crutches. In general, all the transition stages from walking on all fours to walking on two legs are still to be observed among the apes today. The latter gait, however, has never become more than a makeshift for any of them.

It stands to reason that if erect gait among our hairy ancestors became first the rule and then, in time, a necessity, other diverse functions must, in the meantime, have devolved upon the hands. Already among the apes there is some difference in the way the hands and the feet are employed. In climbing, as mentioned above, the hands and feet have different uses. The hands are used mainly for gathering and holding food in the same way as the fore paws of the lower mammals are used. Many apes use their hands to build themselves nests in the trees or even to construct roofs between the branches to protect themselves against the weather, as the chimpanzee, for example, does. With their hands they grasp sticks to defend themselves against enemies, and with their hands they bombard their enemies with fruits and stones. In captivity they use their hands for a number of simple operations copied from human beings. It is in this that one sees the great gulf between the undeveloped hand of even the most man-like apes and the human hand that has been highly perfected by hundreds of thousands of years of labour. The number and general arrangement of the bones and muscles are the same in both hands, but the hand of the lowest savage can perform hundreds of operations that no simian hand can imitate—no simian hand has ever fashioned even the crudest stone knife.

The first operations for which our ancestors gradually learned to adapt their hands during the many thousands of years of transition from ape to man could have been only very simple ones. The lowest savages, even those in whom regression to a more animal-like condition with a simultaneous physical degeneration can be assumed, are nevertheless far superior to these transitional beings. Before the first flint could be fashioned into a knife by human hands, a period of time probably elapsed in comparison with which the historical period known to us appears insignificant. But the decisive step had been taken, *the hand had become free* and could henceforth attain ever greater dexterity; the greater flexibility thus acquired was inherited and increased from generation to generation.

Thus the hand is not only the organ of labour, it is also the product of labour. Labour, adaptation to ever new operations, the inheritance of muscles, ligaments, and, over longer

periods of time, bones that had undergone special development and the ever-renewed employment of this inherited finesse in new, more and more complicated operations, have given the human hand the high degree of perfection required to conjure into being the pictures of a Raphael, the statues of a Thorwaldsen, the music of a Paganini.

But the hand did not exist alone, it was only one member of an integral, highly complex organism. And what benefited the hand, benefited also the whole body it served; and this in two ways.

In the first place, the body benefited from the law of correlation of growth, as Darwin called it. This law states that the specialised forms of separate parts of an organic being are always bound up with certain forms of other parts that apparently have no connection with them. Thus all animals that have red blood cells without cell nuclei, and in which the head is attached to the first vertebra by means of a double articulation (condyles), also without exception possess lacteal glands for suckling their young. Similarly, cloven hoofs in mammals are regularly associated with the possession of a multiple stomach for rumination. Changes in certain forms involve changes in the form of other parts of the body, although we cannot explain the connection. Perfectly white cats with blue eyes are always, or almost always, deaf. The gradually increasing perfection of the human hand, and the commensurate adaptation of the feet for erect gait, have undoubtedly, by virtue of such correlation, reacted on other parts of the organism. However, this action has not as yet been sufficiently investigated for us to be able to do more here than to state the fact in general terms.

Much more important is the direct, demonstrable influence of the development of the hand on the rest of the organism. It has already been noted that our simian ancestors were gregarious; it is obviously impossible to seek the derivation of man, the most social of all animals, from nongregarious immediate ancestors. Mastery over nature began with the development of the hand, with labour, and widened man's horizon at every new advance. He was continually discovering new, hitherto unknown properties in natural objects. On the other hand, the development of labour necessarily helped to bring the members of society closer together by increasing

cases of mutual support and joint activity, and by making clear the advantage of this joint activity to each individual. In short, men in the making arrived at the point where *they had something to say* to each other. Necessity created the organ; the undeveloped larynx of the ape was slowly but surely transformed by modulation to produce constantly more developed modulation, and the organs of the mouth gradually learned to pronounce one articulate sound after another.

Comparison with animals proves that this explanation of the origin of language from and in the process of labour is the only correct one. The little that even the most highly-developed animals need to communicate to each other does not require articulate speech. In a state of nature, no animal feels handicapped by its inability to speak or to understand human speech. It is quite different when it has been tamed by man. The dog and the horse, by association with man, have developed such a good ear for articulate speech that they easily learn to understand any language within their range of concept. Moreover they have acquired the capacity for feelings such as affection for man, gratitude, etc., which were previously foreign to them. Anyone who has had much to do with such animals will hardly be able to escape the conviction that in many cases they *now* feel their inability to speak as a defect, although, unfortunately, it is one that can no longer be remedied because their vocal organs are too specialised in a definite direction. However, where vocal organs exist, within certain limits even this inability disappears. The buccal organs of birds are as different from those of man as they can be, yet birds are the only animals that can learn to speak; and it is the bird with the most hideous voice, the parrot, that speaks best of all. Let no one object that the parrot does not understand what it says. It is true that for the sheer pleasure of talking and associating with human beings, the parrot will chatter for hours at a stretch, continually repeating its whole vocabulary. But within the limits of its range of concepts it can also learn to understand what it is saying. Teach a parrot swear words in such a way that it gets an idea of their meaning (one of the great amusements of sailors returning from the tropics); tease it and you will soon discover that it knows how to use its swear words just as correctly as a Berlin costermonger. The same is true of begging for titbits.

First labour, after it and then with it speech—these were the two most essential stimuli under the influence of which the brain of the ape gradually changed into that of man, which for all its similarity is far larger and more perfect. Hand in hand with the development of the brain went the development of its most immediate instruments—the senses. Just as the gradual development of speech is inevitably accompanied by a corresponding refinement of the organ of hearing, so the development of the brain as a whole is accompanied by a refinement of all the senses. The eagle sees much farther than man, but the human eye discerns considerably more in things than does the eye of the eagle. The dog has a far keener sense of smell than man, but it does not distinguish a hundredth part of the odours that for man are definite signs denoting different things. And the sense of touch, which the ape hardly possesses in its crudest initial form, has been developed only side by side with the development of the human hand itself, through the medium of labour.

The reaction on labour and speech of the development of the brain and its attendant senses, of the increasing clarity of consciousness, power of abstraction and of conclusion, gave both labour and speech an ever-renewed impulse to further development. This development did not reach its conclusion when man finally became distinct from the ape, but on the whole made further powerful progress, its degree and direction varying among different peoples and at different times, and here and there even being interrupted by local or temporary regression. This further development has been strongly urged forward, on the one hand, and guided along more definite directions, on the other, by a new element which came into play with the appearance of fully-fledged man, namely, *society*.

Hundreds of thousands of years—of no greater significance in the history of the earth than one second in the life of man*—certainly elapsed before human society arose out of a troupe of tree-climbing monkeys. Yet it did finally appear. And what do we find once more as the characteristic

* A leading authority in this respect, Sir William Thomson, has calculated that *little more than a hundred million years* could have elapsed since the time when the earth had cooled sufficiently for plants and animals to be able to live on it. (*Note by Engels*)

difference between the troupe of monkeys and human society? *Labour*. The ape herd was satisfied to browse over the feeding area determined for it by geographical conditions or the resistance of neighbouring herds: it undertook migrations and struggles to win new feeding grounds, but it was incapable of extracting from them more than they offered in their natural state, except that it unconsciously fertilised the soil with its own excrement. As soon as all possible feeding grounds were occupied, there could be no further increase in the ape population: the number of animals could at best remain stationary. But all animals waste a great deal of food, and, in addition, destroy in the germ the next generation of the food supply. Unlike the hunter, the wolf does not spare the doe which would provide it with the young the next year; the goats in Greece, that eat away the young bushes before they grow to maturity, have eaten bare all the mountains of the country. This "predatory economy" of animals plays an important part in the gradual transformation of species by forcing them to adapt themselves to other than the usual food, thanks to which their blood acquires a different chemical composition and the whole physical constitution gradually alters, while species that have remained unadapted die out. There is no doubt that this predatory economy contributed powerfully to the transition of our ancestors from ape to man. In a race of apes that far surpassed all others in intelligence and adaptability, this predatory economy must have led to a continual increase in the number of plants used for food and to the consumption of more and more edible parts of food plants. In short, food became more and more varied, as did also the substances entering the body with it, substances that were the chemical premises for the transition to man. But all that was not yet labour in the proper sense of the word. Labour begins with the making of tools. And what are the most ancient tools that we find—the most ancient judging by the heirlooms of prehistoric man that have been discovered, and by the mode of life of the earliest historical peoples and of the rawest of contemporary savages? They are hunting and fishing implements, the former at the same time serving as weapons. But hunting and fishing presuppose the transition from an exclusively vegetable diet to the concomitant use of meat, and this is another important step in the process of

transition from ape to man. A *meat diet* contained in an almost ready state the most essential ingredients required by the organism for its metabolism. By shortening the time required for digestion, it also shortened the other vegetative bodily processes that correspond to those of plant life, and thus gained further time, material and desire for the active manifestation of animal life proper. And the farther man in the making moved from the vegetable kingdom the higher he rose above the animal. Just as becoming accustomed to a vegetable diet side by side with meat converted wild cats and dogs into the servants of man, so also adaptation to a meat diet, side by side with a vegetable diet, greatly contributed towards giving bodily strength and independence to man in the making. The meat diet, however, had its greatest effect on the brain, which now received a far richer flow of the materials necessary for its nourishment and development, and which, therefore, could develop more rapidly and perfectly from generation to generation. With all due respect to the vegetarians man did not come into existence without a meat diet, and if the latter, among all peoples known to us, has led to cannibalism at some time or other (the forefathers of the Berliners, the Weletabians or 'Wilzians, used to eat their parents as late as the tenth century), that is of no consequence to us today.

The meat diet led to two new advances of decisive importance—the harnessing of fire and the domestication of animals. The first still further shortened the digestive process, as it provided the mouth with food already, as it were, half-digested; the second made meat more copious by opening up a new, more regular source of supply in addition to hunting, and moreover provided, in milk and its products, a new article of food at least as valuable as meat in its composition. Thus both these advances were, in themselves, new means for the emancipation of man. It would lead us too far afield to dwell here in detail on their indirect effects notwithstanding the great importance they have had for the development of man and society.

Just as man learned to consume everything edible, he also learned to live in any climate. He spread over the whole of the habitable world, being the only animal fully able to do so of its own accord. The other animals that have become

accustomed to all climates—domestic animals and vermin—did not become so independently, but only in the wake of man. And the transition from the uniformly hot climate of the original home of man to colder regions, where the year was divided into summer and winter, created new requirements—shelter and clothing as protection against cold and damp, and hence new spheres of labour, new forms of activity, which further and further separated man from the animal.

By the combined functioning of hands, speech organs and brain, not only in each individual but also in society, men became capable of executing more and more complicated operations, and were able to set themselves, and achieve, higher and higher aims. The work of each generation itself became different, more perfect and more diversified. Agriculture was added to hunting and cattle raising; then came spinning, weaving, metalworking, pottery and navigation. Along with trade and industry, art and science finally appeared. Tribes developed into nations and states. Law and politics arose, and with them that fantastic reflection of human things in the human mind—religion. In the face of all these images, which appeared in the first place to be products of the mind and seemed to dominate human societies, the more modest productions of the working hand retreated into the background, the more so since the mind that planned the labour was able, at a very early stage in the development of society (for example, already in the primitive family), to have the labour that had been planned carried out by other hands than its own. All merit for the swift advance of civilisation was ascribed to the mind, to the development and activity of the brain. Men became accustomed to explain their actions as arising out of thoughts instead of their needs (which in any case are reflected and perceived in the mind); and so in the course of time there emerged that idealistic world outlook which, especially since the fall of the world of antiquity, has dominated men's minds. It still rules them to such a degree that even the most materialistic natural scientists of the Darwinian school are still unable to form any clear idea of the origin of man, because under this ideological influence they do not recognise the part that has been played therein by labour.

Animals, as has already been pointed out, change the

environment by their activities in the same way, even if not to the same extent, as man does, and these changes, as we have seen, in turn react upon and change those who made them. In nature nothing takes place in isolation. Everything affects and is affected by every other thing, and it is mostly because this manifold motion and interaction is forgotten that our natural scientists are prevented from gaining a clear insight into the simplest things. We have seen how goats have prevented the regeneration of forests in Greece; on the island of St. Helena, goats and pigs brought by the first arrivals have succeeded in exterminating its old vegetation almost completely, and so have prepared the ground for the spreading of plants brought by later sailors and colonists. But animals exert a lasting effect on their environment unintentionally and, as far as the animals themselves are concerned, accidentally. The further removed men are from animals, however, the more their effect on nature assumes the character of premeditated, planned action directed towards definite preconceived ends. The animal destroys the vegetation of a locality without realising what it is doing. Man destroys it in order to sow field crops on the soil thus released, or to plant trees or vines which he knows will yield many times the amount planted. He transfers useful plants and domestic animals from one country to another and thus changes the flora and fauna of whole continents. More than this. Through artificial breeding both plants and animals are so changed by the hand of man that they become unrecognisable. The wild plants from which our grain varieties originated are still being sought in vain. There is still some dispute about the wild animals from which our very different breeds of dogs or our equally numerous breeds of horses are descended.

It goes without saying that it would not occur to us to dispute the ability of animals to act in a planned, premeditated fashion. On the contrary, a planned mode of action exists in embryo wherever protoplasm, living albumen, exists and reacts, that is, carries out definite, even if extremely simple, movements as a result of definite external stimuli. Such reaction takes place even where there is yet no cell at all, far less a nerve cell. There is something of the planned action in the way insect-eating plants capture their prey, although they do it quite unconsciously. In animals the capacity for

conscious, planned action is proportional to the development of the nervous system, and among mammals it attains a fairly high level. While fox-hunting in England one can daily observe how unerringly the fox makes use of its excellent knowledge of the locality in order to elude its pursuers, and how well it knows and turns to account all favourable features of the ground that cause the scent to be lost. Among our domestic animals, more highly developed thanks to association with man, one can constantly observe acts of cunning on exactly the same level as those of children. For, just as the development history of the human embryo in the mother's womb is only an abbreviated repetition of the history, extending over millions of years, of the bodily evolution of our animal ancestors, starting from the worm, so the mental development of the human child is only a still more abbreviated repetition of the intellectual development of these same ancestors, at least of the later ones. But all the planned action of all animals has never succeeded in impressing the stamp of their will upon the earth. That was left for man.

In short, the animal merely *uses* its environment, and brings about changes in it simply by its presence: man by his changes makes it serve his ends, *masters* it. This is the final, essential distinction between man and other animals, and once again it is labour that brings about this distinction.

Let us not, however, flatter ourselves overmuch on account of our huinan victories over nature. For each such victory nature takes its revenge on us. Each victory, it is true, in the first place brings about the results we expected, but in the second and third places it has quite different, unforeseen effects which only too often cancel the first. The people who, in Mesopotamia, Greece, Asia Minor and else-where, destroyed the forests to obtain cultivable land, never dreamed that by removing along with the forests the collecting centres and reservoirs of moisture they were laying the basis for the present forlorn state of those countries. When the Italians of the Alps used up the pine forests on the southern slopes, so carefully cherished on the northern slopes, they had no inkling that by doing so they were cutting at the roots of the dairy industry in their region; they had still less inkling that they were thereby depriving their mountain springs of water for the greater part of the year, and making it possible for

them to pour still more furious torrents on the plains during the rainy seasons. Those who spread the potato in Europe were not aware that with these farinaceous tubers they were at the same time spreading scrofula. Thus at every step we are reminded that we by no means rule over nature like a conqueror over a foreign people, like someone standing outside nature—but that we, with flesh, blood and brain, belong to nature, and exist in its midst, and that all our mastery of it consists in the fact that we have the advantage over all other creatures of being able to learn its laws and apply them correctly.

And, in fact, with every day that passes we are acquiring a better understanding of these laws and getting to perceive both the more immediate and the more remote consequences of our interference with the traditional course of nature. In particular, after the mighty advances made by the natural sciences in the present century, we are more than ever in a position to realise, and hence to control, even the more remote natural consequences of at least our day-to-day production activities. But the more this progresses the more will men not only feel but also know their oneness with nature, and the more impossible will become the senseless and unnatural idea of a contrast between mind and matter, man and nature, soul and body, such as arose after the decline of classical antiquity in Europe and obtained its highest elaboration in Christianity.

It required the labour of thousands of years for us to learn a little of how to calculate the more remote *natural* effects of our actions in the field of production, but it has been still more difficult in regard to the more remote *social* effects of these actions. We mentioned the potato and the resulting spread of scrofula. But what is scrofula compared to the effect which the reduction of the workers to a potato diet had on the living conditions of the masses of the people in whole countries, or compared to the famine the potato blight brought to Ireland in 1847, which consigned to the grave a million Irishmen, nourished solely or almost exclusively on potatoes, and forced the emigration overseas of two million more? When the Arabs learned to distil spirits, it never entered their heads that by so doing they were creating one of the chief weapons for the annihilation of the aborigines of the then still

undiscovered American continent. And when afterwards Columbus discovered this America, he did not know that by doing so he was laying the basis for the Negro slave trade and giving a new lease of life to slavery, which in Europe had long ago been done away with. The men who in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries laboured to create the steam-engine had no idea that they were preparing the instrument which more than any other was to revolutionise social relations throughout the world. Especially in Europe, by concentrating wealth in the hands of a minority and dispossessing the huge majority, this instrument was destined at first to give social and political domination to the bourgeoisie, but later, to give rise to a class struggle between bourgeoisie and proletariat which can end only in the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the abolition of all class antagonisms. But in this sphere too, by long and often cruel experience and by collecting and analysing historical material, we are gradually learning to get a clear view of the indirect, more remote social effects of our production activity, and so are afforded an opportunity to control and regulate these effects as well.

This regulation, however, requires something more than mere knowledge. It requires a complete revolution in our hitherto existing mode of production, and simultaneously a revolution in our whole contemporary social order.

All hitherto existing modes of production have aimed merely at achieving the most immediately and directly useful effect of labour. The further consequences, which appear only later and become effective through gradual repetition and accumulation, were totally neglected. The original common ownership of land corresponded, on the one hand, to a level of development of human beings in which their horizon was restricted in general to what lay immediately available, and presupposed, on the other hand, a certain superfluity of land that would allow some latitude for correcting the possible bad results of this primeval type of economy. When this surplus land was exhausted, common ownership also declined. All higher forms of production, however, led to the division of the population into different classes and thereby to the antagonism of ruling and oppressed classes. Thus the interests of the ruling class became the driving factor of production,

since production was no longer restricted to providing the barest means of subsistence for the oppressed people. This has been put into effect most completely in the capitalist mode of production prevailing today in Western Europe. The individual capitalists, who dominate production and exchange, are able to concern themselves only with the most immediate useful effect of their actions. Indeed, even this useful effect—inasmuch as it is a question of the usefulness of the article that is produced or exchanged—retreats far into the background, and the sole incentive becomes the profit to be made on selling.

Frederick Engels

Excerpt from: THE ORIGIN OF THE FAMILY, PRIVATE PROPERTY, AND THE STATE

In 1884, Frederick Engels wrote the book *The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State. In Connection with the Studies of Lewis G. Morgan*. He based his work on a detailed synopsis of Morgan's book *Ancient Society* compiled by Karl Marx in 1880-1881. Engels used Morgan's investigations, who identified the genus as the cell of primitive society, to further develop the materialistic understanding of history elaborated by Marx.

Given below is an excerpt from the foreword to the first edition of the book, where Engels developed a dialectic-materialist approach to the relationship between the two types of production, namely production of means of livelihood and reproduction of man himself (procreation). In this case, like in the main body of the book, he showed that with development of material production of means of livelihood (food products, clothes, housing, etc.), its role in society grows to become increasingly decisive.

The material that follows also includes an extract from the concluding part of Chapter IX from the book *Barbarism and Civilisation*, where Engels analysed the history of mankind in the early stages of development; revealed the formation of a class society based on private ownership; and brought to light the origin and essence of the state. For the first time in Marxist literature, he convincingly showed that the state resulted from division of society into classes, and that it would inevitably disappear in a classless communist society.

According to the materialistic conception, the determining factor in history is, in the last resort, the production and reproduction of immediate life. But this itself is of a twofold character. On the one hand, the production of the means of subsistence, of food, clothing and shelter and the tools requisite therefore; on the other, the production of human beings themselves, the propagation of the species. The social institutions under which men of a definite historical epoch and of a definite country live are conditioned by both kinds of production: by the stage of development of labour, on the one hand, and of the family, on the other. The less the development of labour, and the more limited its volume of production and, therefore, the wealth of society, the more preponderatingly does the social order appear to be dominated by ties of sex. However, within this structure of society based on ties of sex, the productivity of labour develops more and more; with it, private property and exchange, differences in wealth, the possibility of utilising the labour power of others, and thereby the basis of class antagonisms: new social elements, which strive in the course of generations to adapt the old structure of society to the new conditions, until, finally, the incompatibility of the two leads to a complete revolution. The old society, built on groups based on ties of sex, bursts asunder in the collision of the newly-developed social classes; in its place a new society appears, constituted in a state, the lower units of which are no longer groups based on ties of sex but territorial groups, a society in which the family system is entirely dominated by the property system, and in which the class antagonisms and class struggles, which make up the content of all hitherto *written* history, now freely develop...

Thus; from the foregoing, civilisation is that stage of development of society at which division of labour, the resulting exchange between individuals, and commodity production, which combines the two, reach their complete

unfoldment and revolutionise the whole hitherto existing society.

Production at all former stages of society was essentially collective and, likewise, consumption took place by the direct distribution of the products within larger or smaller communistic communities. This production in common was carried on within the narrowest limits, but concomitantly the producers were masters of their process of production and of their product. They knew what became of the product: they consumed it, it did not leave their hands; and as long as production was carried on on this basis, it could not grow beyond the control of the producers, and it could not raise any strange, phantom powers against them, as is the case regularly and inevitably under civilisation.

But, slowly, division of labour crept into this process of production. It undermined the collective nature of production and appropriation. It made appropriation by individuals the largely prevailing rule, and thus gave rise to exchange between individuals—how, we examined above. Gradually, the production of commodities, became the dominant form.

With the production of commodities, production no longer for one's own consumption but for exchange, the products necessarily pass from hand to hand. The producer parts with his product in the course of exchange; he no longer knows what becomes of it. As soon as money, and with it the merchant, steps in as a middleman between the producers, the process of exchange becomes still more complicated, the ultimate fate of the product still more uncertain. The merchants are numerous and none of them knows what the other is doing. Commodities now pass not only from hand to hand, but also from market to market. The producers have lost control of the aggregate production of the conditions of their own life, and the merchants have not acquired it. Products and production become the playthings of chance.

But chance is only one pole of an interrelation, the other pole of which is called necessity. In nature, where chance also seems to reign, we have long ago demonstrated in each particular field the inherent necessity and regularity that asserts itself in this chance. What is true of nature holds good also for society. The more a social activity, a series of social processes, becomes too powerful for conscious human

control, grows beyond human reach, the more it seems to have been left to pure chance, the more do its peculiar and innate laws assert themselves in this chance, as if by natural necessity. Such laws also control the fortuities of the production and exchange of commodities; these laws confront the individual producer and exchanger as strange and, in the beginning, even as unknown powers, the nature of which must first be laboriously investigated and ascertained. These economic laws of commodity production are modified at the different stages of development of this form of production; on the whole, however, the entire period of civilisation has been dominated by these laws. To this day, the product is master of the producer; to this day, the total production of society is regulated, not by a collectively thought-out plan, but by blind laws, which operate with elemental force, in the last resort in the storms of periodic commercial crises.

We saw above how human labour power became able, at a rather early stage of development of production, to produce considerably more than was needed for the producer's maintenance, and how this stage, in the main, coincided with that of the first appearance of the division of labour and of exchange between individuals. Now, it was not long before the great "truth" was discovered that man, too, may be a commodity: that human power may be exchanged and utilised by converting man into a slave. Men had barely started to engage in exchange when they themselves were exchanged. The active became a passive, whether man wanted it or not.

With slavery, which reached its fullest development in civilisation, came the first great cleavage of society into an exploiting and an exploited class. This cleavage has continued during the whole period of civilisation. Slavery was the first form of exploitation, peculiar to the world of antiquity; it was followed by serfdom in the Middle Ages, and by wage labour in modern times. These are the three great forms of servitude, characteristic of the three great epochs of civilisation; open, and, latterly, disguised slavery, are its steady companions.

The stage of commodity production, with which civilisation began, is marked economically by the introduction of 1) metal money and, thus, of money capital, interest and usury; 2) the merchants acting as middlemen between producers; 3) private ownership of land and mortgage; 4) slave labour as the

prevailing form of production. The form of the family corresponding to civilisation and under it becoming the definitely prevailing form is monogamy, the supremacy of the man over the woman, and the individual family as the economic unit of society. The cohesive force of civilised society is the state, which in all typical periods is exclusively the state of the ruling class, and in all cases remains essentially a machine for keeping down the oppressed, exploited class. Other marks of civilisation are: on the one hand, fixation of the contrast between town and country as the basis of the entire division of social labour; on the other hand, the introduction of wills, by which the property holder is able to dispose of his property even after his death. This institution, which was a direct blow at the old gentile constitution, was unknown in Athens until the time of Solon; in Rome it was introduced very early, but we do not know when.* Among the Germans it was introduced by the priests in order that the good honest German might without hindrance bequeath his property to the Church.

With this constitution as its foundation civilisation has accomplished things with which the old gentile society was totally unable to cope. But it accomplished them by playing on the most sordid instincts and passions of man, and by developing them at the expense of all his other faculties. Naked greed has been the moving spirit of civilisation from the first day of its existence to the present time; wealth, more wealth and wealth again: wealth, not of society, but of this shabby individual was its sole and determining aim. If, in the pursuit of this aim, the increasing development of science and repeated periods of the fullest blooming of art fell into its lap,

it was only because without them the ample present-day achievements in the accumulation of wealth would have been impossible.

Since the exploitation of one class by another is the basis of civilisation, its whole development moves in a continuous contradiction. Every advance in production is at the same time a retrogression in the condition of the oppressed class, that is, of the great majority. What is a boon for the one is necessarily a bane for the other; each new emancipation of one class always means a new oppression of another class. The most striking proof of this is furnished by the introduction of machinery, the effects of which are well known today. And while among barbarians, as we have seen, hardly any distinction could be made between rights and duties, civilisation makes the difference and antithesis between these two plain even to the dullest mind by assigning to one class pretty nearly all the rights, and to the other class pretty nearly all the duties.

But this is not as it ought to be. What is good for the ruling class should be good for the whole of the society with which the ruling class identifies itself. Therefore, the more civilisation advances, the more it is compelled to cover the ills it necessarily creates with the cloak of love, to embellish them, or to deny their existence; in short, to introduce conventional hypocrisy—unknown both in previous forms of society and even in the earliest stages of civilisation—that culminates in the declaration: The exploiting class exploits the oppressed class solely and exclusively in the interest of the exploited class itself; and if the latter fails to appreciate this, and even becomes rebellious, it thereby shows the basest ingratitude to its benefactors, the exploiters.*

V. I. Lenin

Excerpt from:

WHAT THE "FRIENDS OF THE PEOPLE" ARE AND HOW THEY FIGHT THE SOCIAL-DEMOCRATS

Written in 1894, it was in fact a reply to articles in *Russkoye Bogatstvo* against the Marxists. Lenin thoroughly characterised scientific world outlook, dialectical and historical materialism and Marx's economic doctrine. At the same time, he subjected to overall criticism the philosophical, economic, and political views of the "friends of the people"—the liberal Narodniks (opponents of Marxism, advocating reconciliation with Russian tsarism and abandonment of all revolutionary struggle against it), and whose press organ in the 1890s in Russia was the monthly magazine *Russkoye Bogatstvo* (Russian Wealth).

In his work, Lenin for the first time posed the task of creating a Marxist workers' party in Russia. He advanced the idea of a revolutionary alliance of the working class and the peasantry as the principal means for overthrowing tsarism, the feudal lords and the bourgeoisie, and for creating a socialist society. The idea was later implemented in the activities of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union founded by Lenin.

In the excerpt below, Lenin explained and further developed Marx's teaching on society.

This idea of materialism in sociology was in itself a stroke of genius. Naturally, *for the time being* it was only a hypothesis, but one which first created the possibility of a strictly scientific approach to historical and social problems. Hitherto, not knowing how to get down to the simplest primary relations such as those of production, the sociologists undertook the direct investigation and study of political and legal forms, stumbled on the fact that these forms emerge from certain of mankind's ideas in the period in question—and there they stopped; it appeared as if social relations are consciously established by men. But this conclusion, fully expressed in the idea of the *Contrat social** (traces of which are very noticeable in all systems of utopian socialism), was in complete contradiction to all historical observations. It never has been the case, nor is it so now, that the members of society conceive the sum-total of the social relations in which they live as something definite, integral, pervaded by some principle; on the contrary, the mass of people adapt themselves to these relations unconsciously, and have so little conception of them as specific historical social relations that, for instance, an explanation of the exchange relations under which people have lived for centuries was found only in very recent times. Materialism removed this contradiction by carrying the analysis deeper, to the origin of man's social ideas themselves; and its conclusion that the course of ideas depends on the course of things is the only one compatible

* *Contrat social*—one of the chief works of Jean-Jacques Rousseau. It was published in Amsterdam in 1762. The main idea of the book was the assertion that every social system should be the result of a free agreement, of a contract between people. Fundamentally idealistic though it was the "social contract" theory, advanced in the eighteenth century on the eve of the French bourgeois revolution, nevertheless played a revolutionary role. It expressed the demand for bourgeois equality, the abolition of the privileges of the feudal estates, and the establishment of a bourgeois republic.—Ed.

with scientific psychology. Further, and from yet another aspect, this hypothesis was the first to elevate sociology to the level of a science. Hitherto, sociologists had found it difficult to distinguish the important and the unimportant in the complex network of social phenomena (that is the root of subjectivism in sociology) and had been unable to discover any objective criterion for such a demarcation. Materialism provided an absolutely objective criterion by singling out "production relations" as the structure of society, and by making it possible to apply to these relations that general scientific criterion of recurrence whose applicability to sociology the subjectivists denied. So long as they confined themselves to ideological social relations (i.e., such as, before taking shape, pass through man's consciousness*) they could not observe recurrence and regularity in the social phenomena of the various countries, and their science was at best only a description of these phenomena, a collection of raw material. The analysis of material social relations (i.e., of those that take shape without passing through man's consciousness: when exchanging products men enter into production relations without even realising that there is a social relation of production here)—the analysis of material social relations at once made it possible to observe recurrence and regularity and to generalise the systems of the various countries in the single fundamental concept: *social formation*. It was this generalisation alone that made it possible to proceed from the description of social phenomena (and their evaluation from the standpoint of an ideal) to their strictly scientific analysis, which isolates, let us say by way of example, that which distinguishes one capitalist country from another and investigates that which is common to all of them.

Thirdly, and finally, another reason why this hypothesis for the first time made a *scientific* sociology possible was that only the reduction of social relations to production relations and of the latter to the level of the productive forces, provided a firm basis for the conception that the development of formations of society is a process of natural history. And it goes without saying that without such a view there can be no

* We are, of course, referring all the time to the consciousness of *social* relations and no others. (Note by Lenin.)

social science. (The subjectivists, for instance, although they admitted that historical phenomena conform to law, were incapable of regarding their evolution as a process of natural history, precisely because they came to a halt before man's social ideas and aims and were unable to reduce them to material social relations.)

Then, however, Marx, who had expressed this hypothesis in the forties, set out to study the factual (*nota bene*) material. He took one of the social-economic formations—the system of commodity production—and on the basis of a vast mass of data (which he studied for not less than twenty-five years) gave a most detailed analysis of the laws governing the functioning of this formation and its development. This analysis is confined exclusively to production relations between members of society: without ever resorting to features outside the sphere of these production relations for an explanation. Marx makes it possible to discern how the commodity organisation of social economy develops, how it becomes transformed into capitalist organisation, creating antagonistic classes (antagonistic within the bounds of production relations), the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, how it develops the productivity of social labour, and thereby introduces an element that becomes irreconcilably contradictory to the foundations of this capitalist organisation itself.

Such is the *skeleton* of *Capital*. The whole point, however, is that Marx did not content himself with this skeleton, that he did not confine himself to "economic theory" in the ordinary sense of the term, that, while *explaining* the structure and development of the given formation of society *exclusively* through production relations, he nevertheless everywhere and incessantly scrutinised the superstructure corresponding to these production relations and clothed the skeleton in flesh and blood. The reason *Capital* has enjoyed such tremendous success is that this book by a "German economist" showed the whole capitalist social formation to the reader as a living thing—with its everyday aspects, with the actual social manifestation of the class antagonism inherent in production relations, with the bourgeois political superstructure that protects the rule of the capitalist class, with the bourgeois ideas of liberty, equality and so forth, with the bourgeois family relationships. It will now be clear that

the comparison with Darwin is perfectly accurate: *Capital* is nothing but "certain closely interconnected generalising ideas crowning a veritable Mont Blanc of factual material". And if anybody has read *Capital* and contrived not to notice these generalising ideas, it is not the fault of Marx, who, as we have seen, pointed to these ideas even in the preface. And that is not all; such a comparison is correct not only from the external aspect (which for some unknown reason particularly interests Mr. Mikhailovsky), but also from the internal aspect. Just as Darwin put an end to the view of animal and plant species being unconnected, fortuitous, 'created by God' and immutable, and was the first to put biology on an absolutely scientific basis by establishing the mutability and the succession of species, so Marx put an end and was the first to put sociology on a scientific basis by establishing the concept of the economic formation of society as the sum-total of given production relations, by establishing the fact that the development of such formations is a process of natural history.

Now--since the appearance of *Capital*--the materialist conception of history is no longer a hypothesis, but a scientifically proven proposition. And until we get some other attempt to give a scientific explanation of the functioning and development of some formation of society--formation of society, mind you, and not the way of life of some country or people, or even class, etc.--another attempt just as capable of introducing order into the "pertinent facts" as materialism is, that is just as capable of presenting a living picture of a definite formation, while giving it a strictly scientific explanation--until then the materialist conception of history will be a synonym for social science. Materialism is not "primarily a scientific conception of history," as Mr. Mikhailovsky thinks, but the only scientific conception of it.

V. I. Lenin

Excerpt from:

MATERIALISM AND EMPIRIO-CRITICISM

Lenin's principal philosophical work *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism. Critical Comments on a Reactionary Philosophy* was published in 1909. In it, he provided answers to the complex issues arising in the course of social and scientific development. The book comprehensively elucidated the main questions of dialectical and historical materialism and subjected to resolute and plausible criticism the "newest" types of idealistic philosophy (empirio-criticism, pragmatism, etc.) which cause disbelief in existence and in the possibility to cognize the objective laws of social progress. These trends in idealistic philosophy were used by opponents of Marxism to revise its theoretical foundations.

In his book, Lenin comprehensively developed the Marxist theory of cognition and substantiated the teaching that the outside world, existing independently of the consciousness, is reflected in the human mind. He revealed the subjective idealist essence of the theory of cognition developed by the Austrian physicist and philosopher Mach and the Swiss philosopher Avenarius. The groundlessness of their theories of cognition was in that they regarded human sensation as a sort of partition that allegedly separates human consciousness from the environment. Again, they viewed the things man is conscious of as certain conventional signs, symbols, and hieroglyphs that have nothing in common with real things and their properties. However, Lenin showed that human sensations represent copies or images of real things and processes in nature, while human consciousness itself is a dialectical process whereby the mind reflects the existing world.

The book examines important questions of the theory of reflection, namely the essence of truth, i.e. the relationship of absolute and relative truth. Lenin showed the particularly important role of human practice (all types of human sensual and objective activity) in cognition of the environment. He revealed the inseparable inner integrity of dialectical and

historical materialism, the integrity of a materialist explanation of nature, society and human thinking, an integrity that constitutes a characteristic feature of Marxist philosophy.

The book also developed many fundamental issues of historical materialism, namely the relationship between social consciousness and social being, the objective nature and cognoscibility of the laws of social development, the difference of the laws that govern social development from the laws of nature, the relationship between objective necessity and human freedom, and the role of the individual and of human ideas in social progress.

The rapid development of natural science in the late 19th and early 20th centuries and major discoveries in physics revealed that physical knowledge was relative and required a fundamental change in the existing ideas on the structure of nature and on the correlation of its various forms of existence. This engendered so-called physical idealism, which asserted that matter had disappeared. Lenin showed it was a mistake to identify certain physical ideas on the structure of matter (of all the environment) with the philosophical concept of matter.

The development of philosophical thought and science after the publication of *Materialism and Empirio-criticism* corroborated Lenin's conclusions and the correctness of the scientific foundations of dialectical and historical materialism. Lenin's book constitutes a whole epoch in the development of Marxist philosophy and continues to show how the problems involved in social development are to be coped with creatively; moreover, it represents an exemplary exposal of the reactionary essence of bourgeois ideology and revisionism.

Cited below are extracts and certain tenets that give some idea of the major propositions of Lenin's work *Materialism and Empirio-criticism*.

Anybody who reads *Anti-Dühring* and *Ludwig Feuerbach* with the slightest care will find scores of instances when Engels speaks of things and their reflections in the human brain, in our consciousness, thought, etc. Engels does not say that sensations or ideas are "symbols" of things, for consistent materialism must here use "image", picture, or reflection instead of "symbol", as we shall show in detail in the proper place. But the question here is not of this or that formulation of materialism, but of the antithesis between materialism and idealism, of the difference between the two fundamental *lines* in philosophy. Are we to proceed from things to sensation and thought? Or are we to proceed from thought and sensation to things? The first line, i.e., the materialist line, is adopted by Engels. The second line, i.e., the idealist line, is adopted by Mach. No evasions, no sophisms (a multitude of which we shall yet encounter) can remove the clear and indisputable fact that Ernst Mach's doctrine that things are complexes of sensations is subjective idealism and a simple rehash of Berkeleyanism. If bodies are "complexes of sensations", as Mach says, or "combinations of sensations", as Berkeley said, it inevitably follows that the whole world is but my idea. Starting from such a premise it is impossible to arrive at the existence of other people besides oneself: it is the purest solipsism.

* * *

4. *Did Nature Exist Prior to Man?*

We have already seen that this question is a particularly annoying one for the philosophy of Mach and Avenarius. Natural science positively asserts that the earth once existed in such a state that no man or any other creature existed or could have existed on it. Organic matter is a later phenome-

non, the fruit of a long evolution. It follows that there was no sentient matter, no "complexes of sensations", no *self* that was supposedly "indissolubly" connected with the environment in accordance with Avenarius' doctrine. Matter is primary, and thought, consciousness, sensation are products of a very high development. Such is the materialist theory of knowledge, to which natural science instinctively subscribes.

* * *

Engels clearly and explicitly states that he is contesting both Hume and Kant. Yet there is no mention whatever in Hume of "unknowable things-in-themselves". What then is there in common between these two philosophers? It is that they both *in principle fence off* the "appearance" from that which appears, the perception from that which is perceived, the thing-for-us from the "thing-in-itself". Furthermore, Hume does not want to hear of the "thing-in-itself", he regards the very thought of it as philosophically inadmissible, as "metaphysics" (as the Humeans and Kantians call it); whereas Kant grants the existence of the "thing-in-itself", but declares it to be "unknowable", fundamentally different from the appearance, belonging to a fundamentally different realm, the realm of the "beyond" (Jenseits), inaccessible to knowledge, but revealed to faith.

What is the kernel of Engels' objection? Yesterday we did not know that coal tar contains alizarin. Today we have learned that it does. The question is, did coal tar contain alizarin yesterday?

Of course it did. To doubt it would be to make a mockery of modern science.

And if that is so, three important epistemological conclusions follow:

1) Things exist independently of our consciousness, independently of our sensations, outside of us, for it is beyond doubt that alizarin existed in coal tar yesterday and it is equally beyond doubt that yesterday we knew nothing of the existence of this alizarin and received no sensations from it.

2) There is definitely no difference in principle between the phenomenon and the thing-in-itself, and there cannot be any such difference. The only difference is between what is

known and what is not yet known. And philosophical inventions of specific boundaries between the one and the other, inventions to the effect that the thing-in-itself is "beyond" phenomena (Kant), or that we can and must fence ourselves off by some philosophical partition from the problem of a world which in one part or another is still unknown but which exists outside us (Hume)—all this is the sheerest nonsense, Schrulle, crotchet, fantasy.

3) In the theory of knowledge, as in every other sphere of science, we must think dialectically, that is, we must not regard our knowledge as ready-made and unalterable, but must determine how *knowledge* emerges from *ignorance*, how incomplete, inexact knowledge becomes more complete and more exact.

Once we accept the point of view that human knowledge develops from ignorance, we shall find millions of examples of it just as simple as the discovery of alizarin in coal tar, millions of observations not only in the history of science and technology but in the everyday life of each and every one of us that illustrate the transformation of "things-in-themselves" into "things-for-us". the appearance of "phenomena" when our sense-organs experience an impact from external objects, the disappearance of "phenomena" when some obstacle prevents the action upon our sense-organs of an object which we know to exist. The sole and unavoidable deduction to be made from this—a deduction which all of us make in everyday practice and which materialism deliberately places at the foundation of its epistemology—is that outside us, and independently of us, there exist objects, things, bodies and that our perceptions are images of the external world. Mach's converse theory (that bodies are complexes of sensations) is pitiful idealist nonsense.

Matter is a philosophical category denoting the objective reality which is given to man by his sensations, and which is copied, photographed and reflected by our sensations, while existing independently of them. Therefore, to say that such a concept can become "antiquated" is *childish talk*, a senseless repetition of the arguments of fashionable *reactionary*

philosophy. Could the struggle between materialism and idealism, the struggle between the tendencies or lines of Plato and Democritus in philosophy, the struggle between religion and science, the denial of objective truth and its assertion, the struggle between the adherents of supersensible knowledge and its adversaries, have become antiquated during the two thousand years of the development of philosophy?

Acceptance or rejection of the concept matter is a question of the confidence man places in the evidence of his sense organs, a question of the source of our knowledge, a question which has been asked and debated from the very inception of philosophy, which may be disguised in a thousand different garbs by professorial clowns, but which can no more become antiquated than the question whether the source of human knowledge is sight and touch, hearing and smell. To regard our sensations as images of the external world, to recognise objective truth, to hold the materialist theory of knowledge—these are all one and the same thing.

* * *

Human thought then by its nature is capable of giving, and does give, absolute truth, which is compounded of a sum-total of relative truths. Each step in the development of science adds new grains to the sum of absolute truth, but the limits of the truth of each scientific proposition are relative, now expanding, now shrinking with the growth of knowledge.

* * *

The standpoint of life, of practice, should be first and fundamental in the theory of knowledge. And it inevitably leads to materialism, sweeping aside the endless fabrications of professorial scholasticism. Of course, we must not forget that the criterion of practice can never, in the nature of things, either confirm or refute any human idea *completely*. This criterion too is sufficiently "indefinite" not to allow human knowledge to become "absolute", but at the same time it is sufficiently definite to wage a ruthless fight on all varieties of idealism and agnosticism. If what our practice confirms is the sole, ultimate and objective truth, then from

this must follow the recognition that the only path to this truth is the path of science, which holds the materialist point of view.

* * *

There is nothing in the world but matter in motion, and matter in motion cannot move otherwise than in space and time. Human conceptions of space and time are relative, but these relative conceptions go to compound absolute truth. These relative conceptions, in their development, move towards absolute truth and approach nearer and nearer to it. The mutability of human conceptions of space and time no more refutes the objective reality of space and time than the mutability of scientific knowledge of the structure and forms of matter in motion refutes the objective reality of the external world.

* * *

The destructibility of the atom, its inexhaustibility, the mutability of all forms of matter and of its motion, have always been the stronghold of dialectical materialism. All boundaries in nature are conditional, relative, movable, and express the gradual approximation of our mind towards knowledge of matter. But this does not in any way prove that nature, matter itself, is a symbol, a conventional sign, i.e., the product of our mind. The electron is to the atom as a full stop in this book is to the size of a building 200 feet long, 100 feet broad, and 50 feet high (Lodge); it moves with a velocity as high as 270,000 kilometres per second; its mass is a function of its velocity; it makes 500 trillion revolutions in a second—all this is much more complicated than the old mechanics; but it is, nevertheless, movement of matter in space and time. Human reason has discovered many amazing things in nature and will discover still more, and will thereby increase its power over nature. But this does not mean that nature is the creation of our mind or of abstract mind, i.e., of Ward's God, Bogdanov's "substitution", etc.

* * *

Social being and social consciousness are not identical, just as being in general and consciousness in general are not identical. From the fact that in their intercourse men act as conscious beings, it *does not follow* at all that social consciousness is identical with social being. In all social formations of any complexity—and in the capitalist social formation in particular—people in their intercourse are *not conscious* of what kind of social relations are being formed, in accordance with what laws they develop, etc. For instance, a peasant when he sells his grain enters into "intercourse" with the world producers of grain in the world market, but he is not conscious of it; nor is he conscious of the kind of social relations that are formed on the basis of exchange. Social consciousness *reflects* social being—that is Marx's teaching. A reflection may be an approximately true copy of the reflected, but to speak of identity is absurd. Consciousness in general *reflects* being—that is a general thesis of *all* materialism. It is impossible not to see its direct and *inseparable* connection with the thesis of historical materialism: social consciousness *reflects* social being.

Every individual producer in the world economic system realises that he is introducing this or that change into the technique of production; every owner realises that he exchanges certain products for others; but these producers and these owners do not realise that in doing so they are thereby changing *social being*. The sum-total of these changes in all their ramifications in the capitalist world economy could not be grasped even by seventy Marxes. The most important thing is that the *laws* of these changes have been discovered, that the *objective* logic of these changes and of their historical development has in its chief and basic features been disclosed—objective, not in the sense that a society of conscious beings, of people, could exist and develop independently of the existence of conscious beings (and it is only such trifles that Bogdanov *stresses* by his "theory"), but in the sense that social being is *independent* of the *social*

consciousness of people. The fact that you live and conduct your business, beget children, produce products and exchange them, gives rise to an objectively necessary chain of events, a chain of development, which is independent of your *social consciousness*, and is never grasped by the latter completely. The highest task of humanity is to comprehend this objective logic of economic evolution (the evolution of social life) in its general and fundamental features, so that it may be possible to adapt to it one's social consciousness and the consciousness of the advanced classes of all capitalist countries in as definite, clear and critical a fashion as possible.

* * *

Materialism in general recognises objectively real being (matter) as independent of the consciousness, sensation, experience, etc., of humanity. Historical materialism recognises social being as independent of the social consciousness of humanity. In both cases consciousness is only the reflection of being, at best an approximately true (adequate, perfectly exact) reflection of it. From this Marxist philosophy, which is cast from a single piece of steel, you cannot eliminate one basic premise, one essential part, without departing from objective truth, without falling a prey to bourgeois-reactionary falsehood.

V. I. Lenin

THE STATE

On July 11, 1919, Lenin delivered a lecture *The State* at the Sverdlov University in Moscow. In it, he answered the questions concerning the nature and origin of the state and the attitude towards the latter of the Communist Party, which struggles for the overthrow of capitalism and for building a classless communist society. Lenin expounded Marx's and Engels's views on these issues and further developed their doctrine on the state.

Basing himself on historical evidence, Lenin explained the true causes instrumental in the origin of the state. He said that the state initially appears when human society splits into antagonistic classes.

Lenin's lecture permits to obtain a profound understanding of the exceptionally important question regarding the essence and form of the state in twentieth-century capitalist countries. In exposing the false assertions of bourgeois ideologists about freedom and democracy under capitalism, Lenin convincingly showed through concrete examples that, in capitalist countries, the state is actually a machine for maintaining the rule of the bourgeoisie; in fact, it expresses the latter's interests and helps the bourgeoisie exploit the working people of their own country and oppress other nations. Formally, the power of the bourgeoisie may, for instance, be embodied either in a democratic republic or in a fascist government. Yet, in both cases, the bourgeois state represents the unlimited power of an exploiter class, which uses various means to maintain its dominance over the majority of the people.

In his lecture, Lenin summed up the initial experience of the socialist revolution in Russia. He explained the essence of the October Revolution to show that it had overthrown the state of the feudal and capitalist exploiters in Russia to establish Soviet government, the world's first worker and peasant state.

Over years, this government has built in the USSR a society where there are no antagonistic classes and no foundation for exploitation of man by man. The Soviet Union has in fact become a state of the whole people, a state that safeguards the interests of all the members of society.

Given below is the complete text of Lenin's lecture *The State*.

Comrades, according to the plan you have adopted and which has been conveyed to me, the subject of today's talk is the state. I do not know how familiar you are already with this subject. If I am not mistaken your courses have only just begun and this is the first time you will be tackling this subject systematically. If that is so, then it may very well happen that in the first lecture on this difficult subject I may not succeed in making my exposition sufficiently clear and comprehensible to many of my listeners. And if this should prove to be the case, I would request you not to be perturbed by the fact, because the question of the state is a most complex and difficult one, perhaps one that more than any other has been confused by bourgeois scholars, writers and philosophers. It should not therefore be expected that a thorough understanding of this subject can be obtained from one brief talk, at a first sitting. After the first talk on this subject you should make a note of the passages which you have not understood or which are not clear to you, and return to them a second, a third and a fourth time, so that what you have not understood may be further supplemented and elucidated later, both by reading and by various lectures and talks. I hope that we may manage to meet once again and that we shall then be able to exchange opinions on all supplementary questions and see what has remained most unclear. I also hope that in addition to talks and lectures you will devote some time to reading at least a few of the most important works of Marx and Engels. I have no doubt that these most important works are to be found in the lists of books and in the handbooks which are available in your library for the students of the Soviet and Party school; and although, again, some of you may at first be dismayed by the difficulty of the exposition, I must again warn you that you should not let this worry you; what is unclear at a first reading will become clear at a second reading, or when you subsequently approach the

question from a somewhat different angle. For I once more repeat that the question is so complex and has been so confused by bourgeois scholars and writers that anybody who desires to study it seriously and master it independently must attack it several times, return to it again and again and consider it from various angles in order to attain a clear, sound understanding of it. Because it is such a fundamental, such a basic question in all politics, and because not only in such stormy and revolutionary times as the present, but even in the most peaceful times, you will come across it every day in any newspaper in connection with any economic or political question it will be all the easier to return to it. Every day, in one context or another, you will be returning to the question: what is the state, what is its nature, what is its significance and what is the attitude of our Party, the party that is fighting for the overthrow of capitalism, the Communist Party—what is its attitude to the state? And the chief thing is that you should acquire, as a result of your reading, as a result of the talks and lectures you will hear on the state, the ability to approach this question independently, since you will be meeting with it on the most diverse occasions, in connection with the most trifling questions, in the most unexpected contexts and in discussions and disputes with opponents. Only when you learn to find your way about independently in this question may you consider yourself sufficiently confirmed in your convictions and able with sufficient success to defend them against anybody and at any time.

After these brief remarks, I shall proceed to deal with the question itself—what is the state, how did it arise and fundamentally what attitude to the state should be displayed by the party of the working class, which is fighting for the complete overthrow of capitalism—the Communist Party?

I have already said that you are not likely to find another question which has been so confused, deliberately and unwittingly, by representatives of bourgeois science, philosophy, jurisprudence, political economy and journalism, as the question of the state. To this day it is very often confused with religious questions; not only those professing religious doctrines (it is quite natural to expect it of them), but even people who consider themselves free from religious prejudice, very often confuse the specific question of the

state with questions of religion and endeavour to build up a doctrine—very often a complex one, with an ideological, philosophical approach and argumentation—which claims that the state is something divine, something supernatural, that it is a certain force by virtue of which mankind has lived, that it is a force of divine origin which confers on people, or can confer on people, or which brings with it something that is not of man, but is given him from without. And it must be said that this doctrine is so closely bound up with the interests of the exploiting classes—the landowners and the capitalists—so serves their interests, has so deeply permeated all the customs, views and science of the gentlemen who represent the bourgeoisie, that you will meet with vestiges of it on every hand, even in the view of the state held by the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, although they are convinced that they can regard the state with sober eyes and reject indignantly the suggestion that they are under the sway of religious prejudices. This question has been so confused and complicated because it affects the interests of the ruling classes more than any other question (yielding place in this respect only to the foundations of economic science). The doctrine of the state serves to justify social privilege, the existence of exploitation, the existence of capitalism—and that is why it would be the greatest mistake to expect impartiality on this question, to approach it in the belief that people who claim to be scientific can give you a purely scientific view on the subject. In the question of the state, in the doctrine of the state, in the theory of the state, when you have become familiar with it and have gone into it deeply enough, you will always discern the struggle between different classes, a struggle which is reflected or expressed in a conflict of views on the state, in the estimate of the role and significance of the state.

To approach this question as scientifically as possible we must cast at least a fleeting glance back on the history of the state, its emergence and development. The most reliable thing in a question of social science, and one that is most necessary in order really to acquire the habit of approaching this question correctly and not allowing oneself to get lost in the mass of detail or in the immense variety of conflicting opinions—the most important thing if one is to approach this

question scientifically is not to forget the underlying historical connection, to examine every question from the standpoint of how the given phenomenon arose in history and what were the principal stages in its development, and, from the standpoint of its development, to examine what it has become today.

I hope that in studying this question of the state you will acquaint yourselves with Engels's book *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*. This is one of the fundamental works of modern socialism, every sentence of which can be accepted with confidence, in the assurance that it has not been said at random but is based on immense historical and political material. Undoubtedly, not all the parts of this work have been expounded in an equally popular and comprehensible way; some of them presume a reader who already possesses a certain knowledge of history and economics. But I again repeat that you should not be perturbed if on reading this work you do not understand it at once. Very few people do. But returning to it later, when your interest has been aroused, you will succeed in understanding the greater part, if not the whole of it. I refer to this book because it gives the correct approach to the question in the sense mentioned. It begins with a historical sketch of the origin of the state.

This question, like every other—for example, that of the origin of capitalism, the exploitation of man by man, socialism, how socialism arose, what conditions gave rise to it—can be approached soundly and confidently only if we cast a glance back on the history of its development as a whole. In connection with this problem it should first of all be noted that the state has not always existed. There was a time when there was no state. It appears wherever and whenever a division of society into classes appears, whenever exploiters and exploited appear.

Before the first form of exploitation of man by man arose, the first form of division into classes—slave-owners and slaves—there existed the patriarchal family, or, as it is sometimes called, the *clan* family. (Clan—tribe; at the time people of one kin lived together.) Fairly definite traces of these primitive times have survived in the life of many primitive peoples; and if you take any work whatsoever on

primitive civilisation, you will always come across more or less definite descriptions, indications and recollections of the fact that there was a time, more or less similar to primitive communism, when the division of society into slave-owners and slaves did not exist. And in those times there was no state, no special apparatus for the systematic application of force and the subjugation of people by force. It is such an apparatus that is called the state.

In primitive society, when people lived in small family groups and were still at the lowest stages of development, in a condition approximating to savagery—an epoch from which modern, civilised human society is separated by several thousand years—there were yet no signs of the existence of a state. We find the predominance of custom, authority, respect, the power enjoyed by the elders of the clan; we find this power sometimes accorded to women—the position of women then was not like the downtrodden and oppressed condition of women today—but nowhere do we find a special category of people set apart to rule others and who, for the sake and purpose of rule, systematically and permanently have at their disposal a certain apparatus of coercion, an apparatus of violence, such as is represented at the present time, as you all realise, by armed contingents of troops, prisons and other means of subjugating the will of others by force—all that which constitutes the essence of the state.

If we get away from what are known as religious teachings, from the subtleties, philosophical arguments and various opinions advanced by bourgeois scholars, if we get away from these and try to get at the real core of the matter, we shall find that the state really does amount to such an apparatus of rule which stands outside society as a whole. When there appears such a special group of men occupied solely with government, and who in order to rule need a special apparatus of coercion to subjugate the will of others by force—prisons, special contingents of men, armies, etc.—then there appears the state.

But there was a time when there was no state, when general ties, the community itself, discipline and the ordering of work were maintained by force of custom and tradition, by the authority or the respect enjoyed by the elders of the clan—or by women—who in those times not only frequently enjoyed a

status equal to that of men, but not infrequently enjoyed an even higher status—and when there was no special category of persons who were specialists in ruling. History shows that the state as a special apparatus for coercing people arose wherever and whenever there appeared a division of society into classes, that is, a division into groups of people some of which were permanently in a position to appropriate the labour of others, where some people exploited others.

And this division of society into classes must always be clearly borne in mind as a fundamental fact of history. The development of all human societies for thousands of years, in all countries without exception, reveals a general conformity to law, a regularity and consistency; so that at first we had a society without classes—the original patriarchal, primitive society, in which there were no aristocrats; then we had a society based on slavery—a slave-owning society. The whole of modern, civilised Europe has passed through this stage—slavery ruled supreme two thousand years ago. The vast majority of peoples of the other parts of the world also passed through this stage. Traces of slavery survive to this day among the less developed peoples; you will find the institution of slavery in Africa, for example, at the present time. The division into slave-owners and slaves was the first important class division. The former group not only owned all the means of production—the land and the implements, however poor and primitive they may have been in those times—but also owned people. This group was known as slave-owners, while those who laboured and supplied labour for others were known as slaves.

This form was followed in history by another—feudalism. In the great majority of countries slavery in the course of its development evolved into serfdom. The fundamental division of society was now into feudal lords and peasant serfs. The form of relations between people changed. The slave-owners had regarded the slaves as their property; the law had confirmed this view and regarded the slave as a chattel completely owned by the slave-owner. As far as the peasant serf was concerned, class oppression and dependence remained, but it was not considered that the feudal lord owned the peasants as chattels, but that he was only entitled to their labour, to the obligatory performance of certain services. In

practice, as you know, serfdom, especially in Russia where it survived longest of all and assumed the crudest forms, in no way differed from slavery.

Further, with the development of trade, the appearance of the world market and the development of money circulation, a new class arose within feudal society—the capitalist class. From the commodity, the exchange of commodities and the rise of the power of money, there derived the power of capital. During the eighteenth century, or rather, from the end of the eighteenth century and during the nineteenth century, revolutions took place all over the world. Feudalism was abolished in all the countries of Western Europe. Russia was the last country in which this took place. In 1861 a radical change took place in Russia as well; as a consequence of this one form of society was replaced by another—feudalism was replaced by capitalism, under which division into classes remained, as well as various traces and remnants of serfdom, but fundamentally the division into classes assumed a different form.

The owners of capital, the owners of the land and the owners of the factories in all capitalist countries constituted and still constitute an insignificant minority of the population who have complete command of the labour of the whole people, and, consequently, command, oppress and exploit the whole mass of labourers, the majority of whom are proletarians, wage-workers, who procure their livelihood in the process of production only by the sale of their own worker's hands, their labour-power. With the transition to capitalism, the peasants, who had been disunited and downtrodden in feudal times, were converted partly (the majority) into proletarians, and partly (the minority) into wealthy peasants who themselves hired labourers and who constituted a rural bourgeoisie.

This fundamental fact—the transition of society from primitive forms of slavery to serfdom and finally to capitalism—you must always bear in mind, for only by remembering this fundamental fact, only by examining all political doctrines placed in this fundamental scheme, will you be able properly to appraise these doctrines and understand what they refer to; for each of these great periods in the history of mankind, slave-owning, feudal and capitalist, embraces scores and

hundreds of centuries and presents such a mass of political forms, such a variety of political doctrines, opinions and revolutions, that this extreme diversity and immense variety (especially in connection with the political, philosophical and other doctrines of bourgeois scholars and politicians) can be understood only by firmly holding, as to a guiding thread, to this division of society into classes, this change in the forms of class rule, and from this standpoint examining all social questions—economic, political, spiritual, religious, etc.

If you examine the state from the standpoint of this fundamental division, you will find that before the division of society into classes, as I have already said, no state existed. But as the social division into classes arose and took firm root, as class society arose, the state also arose and took firm root. The history of mankind knows scores and hundreds of countries that have passed or are still passing through slavery, feudalism and capitalism. In each of these countries, despite the immense historical changes that have taken place, despite all the political vicissitudes and all the revolutions due to this development of mankind, to the transition from slavery through feudalism to capitalism and to the present world-wide struggle against capitalism, you will always discern the emergence of the state. It has always been a certain apparatus which stood outside society and consisted of a group of people engaged solely, or almost solely, or mainly, in ruling. People are divided into the ruled, and into specialists in ruling, those who rise above society and are called rulers, statesmen. This apparatus, this group of people who rule others, always possesses certain means of coercion, of physical force, irrespective of whether this violence over people is expressed in the primitive club, or in more perfected types of weapons in the epoch of slavery, or in the fire-arms which appeared in the Middle Ages, or, finally, in modern weapons, which in the twentieth century are technical marvels and are based entirely on the latest achievements of modern technology. The methods of violence changed, but whenever there was a state there existed in every society a group of persons who ruled, who commanded, who dominated and who in order to maintain their power possessed an apparatus of physical coercion, an apparatus of violence, with those weapons which corresponded to the technical level of the

given epoch. And by examining these general phenomena, by asking ourselves why no state existed when there were no classes, when there were no exploiters and exploited, and why it appeared when classes appeared—only in this way shall we find a definite answer to the question of what is the nature and significance of the state.

The state is a machine for maintaining the rule of one class over another. When there were no classes in society, when, before the epoch of slavery, people laboured in primitive conditions of greater equality, in conditions when the productivity of labour was still at its lowest, and when primitive man could barely procure the wherewithal for the crudest and most primitive existence, a special group of people whose function is to rule and to dominate the rest of society, had not and could not yet have emerged. Only when the first form of the division of society into classes appeared, only when slavery appeared, when a certain class of people, by concentrating on the crudest forms of agricultural labour, could produce a certain surplus, when this surplus was not absolutely essential for the most wretched existence of the slave and passed into the hands of the slave-owner, when in this way the existence of this class of slave-owners was secure—then in order that it might take firm root it was necessary for a state to appear.

And it did appear—the slave-owning state, an apparatus which gave the slave-owners power and enabled them to rule over the slaves. Both society and the state were then on a much smaller scale than they are now, they possessed incomparably poorer means of communication—the modern means of communication did not then exist. Mountains, rivers and seas were immeasurably greater obstacles than they are now, and the state took shape within far narrower geographical boundaries. A technically weak state apparatus served a state confined within relatively narrow boundaries and with a narrow range of action. Nevertheless, there did exist an apparatus which compelled the slaves to remain in slavery, which kept one part of society subjugated to and oppressed by another. It is impossible to compel the greater part of society to work systematically for the other part of society without a permanent apparatus of coercion. So long as there were no classes, there was no apparatus of this sort. When

classes appeared, everywhere and always, as the division grew and took firmer hold, there also appeared a special institution—the state. The forms of state were extremely varied. As early as the period of slavery we find diverse forms of the state in the countries that were the most advanced, cultured and civilised according to the standards of the time—for example, in ancient Greece and Rome—which were based entirely on slavery. At that time there was already a difference between monarchy and republic, between aristocracy and democracy. A monarchy is the power of a single person, a republic is the absence of any non-elected authority; an aristocracy is the power of a relatively small minority, a democracy is the power of the people (democracy in Greek literally means the power of the people). All these differences arose in the epoch of slavery. Despite these differences, the state of the slave-owning epoch was a slave-owning state, irrespective of whether it was a monarchy or a republic, aristocratic or democratic.

In every course on the history of ancient times, in any lecture on this subject, you will hear about the struggle which was waged between the monarchical and republican states. But the fundamental fact is that the slaves were not regarded as human beings—not only were they not regarded as citizens, they were not even regarded as human beings. Roman law regarded them as chattels. The law of manslaughter, not to mention the other laws for the protection of the person, did not extend to slaves. It defended only the slave-owners, who were alone recognised as citizens with full rights. But whether a monarchy was instituted or a republic, it was a monarchy of the slave-owners or a republic of the slave-owners. All rights were enjoyed by the slave-owners, while the slave was a chattel in the eyes of the law; and not only could any sort of violence be perpetrated against a slave, but even the killing of a slave was not considered a crime. Slave-owning republics differed in their internal organisation, there were aristocratic republics and democratic republics. In an aristocratic republic only a small number of privileged persons took part in the elections; in a democratic republic everybody took part—but everybody meant only the slave-owners, that is, everybody except the slaves. This fundamental fact must be borne in mind, because it throws more light

than any other on the question of the state and clearly demonstrates the nature of the state.

The state is a machine for the oppression of one class by another, a machine for holding in obedience to one class other, subordinated classes. There are various forms of this machine. The slave-owning state could be a monarchy, an aristocratic republic or even a democratic republic. In fact the forms of government varied extremely, but their essence was always the same; the slaves enjoyed no rights and constituted an oppressed class; they were not regarded as human beings. We find the same thing in the feudal state.

The change in the form of exploitation transformed the slave-owning state into the feudal state. This was of immense importance. In slave-owning society the slave enjoyed no rights whatever and was not regarded as a human being; in feudal society the peasant was bound to the soil. The chief distinguishing feature of serfdom was that the peasants (and at that time the peasants constituted the majority; the urban population was still very small) were considered bound to the land—this is the very basis of "serfdom". The peasant might work a definite number of days for himself on the plot assigned to him by the landlord; on the other days the peasant serf worked for his lord. The essence of class society remained—society was based on class exploitation. Only the owners of the land could enjoy full rights; the peasants had no rights at all. In practice their condition differed very little from the condition of slaves in the slave-owning state. Nevertheless, a wider road was opened for their emancipation, for the emancipation of the peasants, since the peasant serf was not regarded as the direct property of the lord. He could work part of his time on his own plot, could, so to speak, belong to himself to some extent; and with the wider opportunities for the development of exchange and trade relations the feudal system steadily disintegrated and the scope of emancipation of the peasantry steadily widened. Feudal society was always more complex than slave society. There was a greater development of trade and industry, which even in those days led to capitalism. In the Middle Ages feudalism predominated. And here too the forms of state varied, here too we find both the monarchy and the republic, although the latter was much more weakly expressed. But

always the feudal lord was regarded as the only ruler. The peasant serfs were deprived of absolutely all political rights.

Neither under slavery nor under the feudal system could a small minority of people dominate over the vast majority without coercion. History is full of the constant attempts of the oppressed classes to throw off oppression. The history of slavery contains records of wars of emancipation from slavery which lasted for decades. Incidentally, the name "Spartacist" now adopted by the German Communists—the only German party which is really fighting against the yoke of capitalism—was adopted by them because Spartacus was one of the most prominent heroes of one of the greatest revolts of slaves, which took place about two thousand years ago. For many years the seemingly omnipotent Roman Empire, which rested entirely on slavery, experienced the shocks and blows of a widespread uprising of slaves who armed and united to form a vast army under the leadership of Spartacus. In the end they were defeated, captured and put to torture by the slave-owners. Such civil wars mark the whole history of the existence of class society. I have just mentioned an example of the greatest of these civil wars in the epoch of slavery. The whole epoch of feudalism is likewise marked by constant uprisings of the peasants. For example, in Germany in the Middle Ages the struggle between the two classes—the landlords and the serfs—assumed wide proportions and was transformed into a civil war of the peasants against the landowners. You are all familiar with similar examples of repeated uprisings of the peasants against the feudal land-owners in Russia.

In order to maintain their rule and to preserve their power, the feudal lords had to have an apparatus by which they could unite under their subjugation a vast number of people and subordinate them to certain laws and regulations; and all these laws fundamentally amounted to one thing—the maintenance of the power of the lords over the peasant serfs. And this was the feudal state, which in Russia, for example, or in quite backward Asiatic countries (where feudalism prevails to this day) differed in form—it was either a republic or a monarchy. When the state was a monarchy, the rule of one person was recognised; when it was a republic, the participation of the elected representatives of landowning society was in one

degree or another recognised—this was in feudal society. Feudal society represented a division of classes under which the vast majority—the peasant serfs—were completely subjected to an insignificant minority—the owners of the land.

The development of trade, the development of commodity exchange, led to the emergence of a new class—the capitalists. Capital took shape as such at the close of the Middle Ages, when, after the discovery of America, world trade developed enormously, when the quantity of precious metals increased, when silver and gold became the medium of exchange, when money circulation made it possible for individuals to possess tremendous wealth. Silver and gold were recognised as wealth all over the world. The economic power of the landowning class declined and the power of the new class—the representatives of capital—developed. The reconstruction of society was such that all citizens seemed to be equal, the old division into slave-owners and slaves disappeared, all were regarded as equal before the law irrespective of what capital each owned; whether he owned land as private property, or was a poor man who owned nothing but his labour-power—all were equal before the law. The law protects everybody equally; it protects the property of those who have it from attack by the masses who, possessing no property, possessing nothing but their labour-power, grow steadily impoverished and ruined and become converted into proletarians. Such is capitalist society.

I cannot dwell on it in detail. You will return to this when you come to discuss the Programme of the Party—you will then hear a description of capitalist society. This society advanced against serfdom, against the old feudal system, under the slogan of liberty. But it was liberty for those who owned property. And when feudalism was shattered, which occurred at the end of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth century—in Russia it occurred later than in other countries, in 1861—the feudal state was then superseded by the capitalist state, which proclaims liberty for the whole people as its slogan, which declares that it expresses the will of the whole people and denies that it is a class state. And here there developed a struggle between the socialists, who are fighting for the liberty of the whole people, and the capitalist state—a struggle which has led to the

creation of the Soviet Socialist Republic and which is going on throughout the world.

To understand the struggle that has been started against world capital, to understand the nature of the capitalist state, we must remember that when the capitalist state advanced against the feudal state it entered the fight under the slogan of liberty. The abolition of feudalism meant liberty for the representatives of the capitalist state and served their purpose, inasmuch as serfdom was breaking down and the peasants had acquired the opportunity of owning as their full property the land which they had purchased for compensation or in part by quit-rent—this did not concern the state: it protected property irrespective of its origin, because the state was founded on private property. The peasants became private owners in all the modern, civilised states. Even when the landowner surrendered part of his land to the peasant, the state protected private property, rewarding the landowner by compensation, by letting him take money for the land. The state as it were declared that it would fully preserve private property, and it accorded it every support and protection. The state recognised the property rights of every merchant, industrialist and manufacturer. And this society, based on private property, on the power of capital, on the complete subjection of the propertyless workers and labouring masses of the peasantry, proclaimed that its rule was based on liberty. Combatting feudalism, it proclaimed freedom of property and was particularly proud of the fact that the state had ceased, supposedly, to be a class state.

Yet the state continued to be a machine which helped the capitalists to hold the poor peasants and the working class in subjection. But in outward appearance it was free. It proclaimed universal suffrage, and declared through its champions, preachers, scholars and philosophers, that it was not a class state. Even now, when the Soviet Socialist Republics have begun to fight the state, they accuse us of violating liberty, of building a state based on coercion, on the suppression of some by others, whereas they represent a popular, democratic state. And now, when the world socialist revolution has begun, and when the revolution has succeeded in some countries, when the fight against world capital has grown particularly acute, this question of the state has

acquired the greatest importance and has become, one might say, the most burning one, the focus of all present-day political questions and political disputes.

Whichever party we take in Russia or in any of the more civilised countries, we find that nearly all political disputes, disagreements and opinions now centre around the conception of the state. Is the state in a capitalist country, in a democratic republic especially one like Switzerland or the U.S.A.—in the freest democratic republics, an expression of the popular will, the sum total of the general decision of the people, the expression of the national will, and so forth; or is the state a machine that enables the capitalists of those countries to maintain their power over the working class and the peasantry? That is the fundamental question around which all political disputes all over the world now centre. What do they say about Bolshevism? The bourgeois press abuses the Bolsheviks. You will not find a single newspaper that does not repeat the hackneyed accusation that the Bolsheviks violate popular rule. If our Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries in their simplicity of heart (perhaps it is not simplicity, or perhaps it is the simplicity which the proverb says is worse than robbery) think that they discovered and invented the accusation that the Bolsheviks have violated liberty and popular rule, they are ludicrously mistaken. Today every one of the richest newspapers in the richest countries, which spend tens of millions on their distribution and disseminate bourgeois lies and imperialist policy in tens of millions of copies—every one of these newspapers repeats these basic arguments and accusations against Bolshevism, namely, that the U.S.A., Britain and Switzerland are advanced states based on popular rule, whereas the Bolshevik republic is a state of bandits in which liberty is unknown, and that the Bolsheviks have violated the idea of popular rule and have even gone so far as to disperse the Constituent Assembly. These terrible accusations against the Bolsheviks are repeated all over the world. These accusations lead us directly to the question—what is the state? In order to understand these accusations, in order to study them and have a fully intelligent attitude towards them, and not to examine them on hearsay but with a firm opinion of our own, we must have a clear idea of what the state is. We have before us

capitalist states of every kind and all the theories in defence of them which were created before the war. In order to answer the question properly we must critically examine all these theories and views.

I have already advised you to turn for help to Engels's book *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*. This book says that every state in which private ownership of the land and means of production exists, in which capital dominates, however democratic it may be, is a capitalist state, a machine used by the capitalists to keep the working class and the poor peasants in subjection; while universal suffrage, a Constituent Assembly, a parliament are merely a form, a sort of promissory note, which does not change the real state of affairs.

The forms of domination of the state may vary: capital manifests its power in one way where one form exists, and in another way where another form exists—but essentially the power is in the hands of capital, whether there are voting qualifications or some other rights or not, or whether the republic is a democratic one or not—in fact, the more democratic it is the cruder and more cynical is the rule of capitalism. One of the most democratic republics in the world is the United States of America, yet nowhere (and those who have been there since 1905 probably know it) is the power of capital, the power of a handful of multimillionaires over the whole of society, so crude and so openly corrupt as in America. Once capital exists, it dominates the whole of society, and no democratic republic, no franchise can change its nature.

The democratic republic and universal suffrage were an immense progressive advance as compared with feudalism: they have enabled the proletariat to achieve its present unity and solidarity, to form those firm and disciplined ranks which are waging a systematic struggle against capital. There was nothing even approximately resembling this among the peasant serfs, not to speak of the slaves. The slaves, as we know, revolted, rioted, started civil wars, but they could never create a class-conscious majority and parties to lead the struggle, they could not clearly realise what their aims were, and even in the most revolutionary moments of history they were always pawns in the hands of the ruling classes. The

bourgeois republic, parliament, universal suffrage—all represent great progress from the standpoint of the world development of society. Mankind moved towards capitalism, and it was capitalism alone which, thanks to urban culture, enabled the oppressed proletarian class to become conscious of itself and to create the world working-class movement, the millions of workers organised all over the world in parties—the socialist parties which are consciously leading the struggle of the masses. Without parliamentarism, without an electoral system, this development of the working class would have been impossible. That is why all these things have acquired such great importance in the eyes of the broad masses of people. That is why a radical change seems to be so difficult. It is not only the conscious hypocrites, scientists and priests that uphold and defend the bourgeois lie that the state is free and that it is its mission to defend the interests of all; so also do a large number of people who sincerely adhere to the old prejudices and who cannot understand the transition from the old, capitalist society to socialism. Not only people who are directly dependent on the bourgeoisie, not only those who live under the yoke of capital or who have been bribed by capital (there are a large number of all sorts of scientists, artists, priests, etc., in the service of capital), but even people who are simply under the sway of the prejudice of bourgeois liberty, have taken up arms against Bolshevism all over the world because when the Soviet Republic was founded it rejected these bourgeois lies and openly declared: you say your state is free, whereas in reality, as long as there is private property, your state, even if it is a democratic republic, is nothing but a machine used by the capitalists to suppress the workers, and the freer the state, the more clearly is this expressed. Examples of this are Switzerland in Europe and the United States in America. Nowhere does capital rule so cynically and ruthlessly, and nowhere is it so clearly apparent, as in these countries, although they are democratic republics, no matter how prettily they are painted and notwithstanding all the talk about labour democracy and the equality of all citizens. The fact is that in Switzerland and the United States capital dominates, and every attempt of the workers to achieve the slightest real improvement in their condition is immediately met by civil war. There are fewer

soldiers, a smaller standing army, in these countries—Switzerland has a militia and every Swiss has a gun at home, while in America there was no standing army until quite recently—and so when there is a strike the bourgeoisie arms, hires soldiery and suppresses the strike; and nowhere is this suppression of the working-class movement accompanied by such ruthless severity as in Switzerland and the U.S.A., and nowhere does the influence of capital in parliament manifest itself as powerfully as in these countries. The power of capital is everything, the stock exchange is everything, while parliament and elections are marionettes, puppets.... But the eyes of the workers are being opened more and more, and the idea of Soviet government is spreading farther and farther afield, especially after the bloody carnage we have just experienced. The necessity for a relentless war on the capitalists is becoming clearer and clearer to the working class.

Whatever guise a republic may assume, however democratic it may be, if it is a bourgeois republic, if it retains private ownership of the land and factories, and if private capital keeps the whole of society in wage-slavery, that is, if the republic does not carry out what is proclaimed in the Programme of our Party and in the Soviet Constitution, then this state is a machine for the suppression of some people by others. And we shall place this machine in the hands of the class that is to overthrow the power of capital. We shall reject all the old prejudices about the state meaning universal equality—for that is a fraud: as long as there is exploitation there cannot be equality. The landowner cannot be the equal of the worker, or the hungry man the equal of the full man. This machine called the state, before which people bowed in superstitious awe, believing the old tales that it means popular rule, tales which the proletariat declares to be a bourgeois lie—this machine the proletariat will smash. So far we have deprived the capitalists of this machine and have taken it over. We shall use this machine, or bludgeon, to destroy all exploitation. And when the possibility of exploitation no longer exists anywhere in the world, when there are no longer owners of land and owners of factories, and when there is no longer a situation in which some gorge while others starve, only when the possibility of this no longer exists shall we

consign this machine to the scrap-heap. Then there will be no state and no exploitation. Such is the view of our Communist Party. I hope that we shall return to this subject in subsequent lectures, return to it again and again.

V. I. Lenin

SOCIALISM AND RELIGION

Lenin wrote the article *Socialism and Religion* in 1905, when Russia was the scene of a broad discussion concerning the attitude of various political parties towards religion. In it, Lenin, the leader of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party (now the Communist Party of the Soviet Union), showed the latter's stand towards religion.

In *Socialism and Religion*, Lenin exposed the bourgeoisie, which used religion (belief in the supernatural) to enslave the working people spiritually. Hence, the struggle of Russia's workers against the capitalist system implied the need to free the working people from religious enslavement by the exploiter state.

Lenin clearly showed the socialist objectives. He advanced and substantiated the important demand that religion and religious societies be separated from the state. Every man should be absolutely free to profess any religion or none at all, and all creed-based discrimination of citizens is unacceptable.

Lenin's article clearly shows the communist attitude towards religion. Religion cannot be the private concern of members of the Communist Party, since its voluntary membership consists solely of people convinced in the power of science and in the impotence and futility of religion. The Communist Party advocates a scientific world outlook incompatible with religion.

Lenin's article is important in yet another respect. In it, he resolutely came out against all kinds of hostility between believers and non-believers, for such hostility distracts the working people from their struggle against an exploiter system. On the other hand, the feudal lords and the bourgeoisie, who want to split the ranks of the working people in their effort to make their oppression and enslavement easier, are interested in such enmity.

In the USSR, the very important ideas stated by Lenin have been translated into reality. According to Article 34 of the Constitution of the USSR, all citizens are equal before law irrespective of their creed. Article 52 states: "Citizens of the USSR are guaranteed freedom of conscience, that is, the right to profess or not to profess any religion, and to conduct religious worship or atheistic propaganda. Incitement of hostility or hatred on religious grounds is prohibited.

"In the USSR, the church is separated from the state, and the school from the church."

Cited below is the complete text of Lenin's article *Socialism and Religion*.

Present-day society is wholly based on the exploitation of the vast masses of the working class by a tiny minority of the population, the class of the landowners and that of the capitalists. It is a slave society, since the "free" workers, who all their life work for the capitalists, are "entitled" only to such means of subsistence as are essential for the maintenance of slaves who produce profit, for the safeguarding and perpetuation of capitalist slavery.

The economic oppression of the workers inevitably calls forth and engenders every kind of political oppression and social humiliation, the coarsening and darkening of the spiritual and moral life of the masses. The workers may secure a greater or lesser degree of political liberty to fight for their economic emancipation, but no amount of liberty will rid them of poverty, unemployment, and oppression until the power of capital is overthrown. Religion is one of the forms of spiritual oppression which everywhere weighs down heavily upon the masses of the people, overburdened by their perpetual work for others, by want and isolation. Impotence of the exploited classes in their struggle against the exploiters just as inevitably gives rise to the belief in a better life after death as impotence of the savage in his battle with nature gives rise to belief in gods, devils, miracles, and the like. Those who toil and live in want all their lives are taught by religion to be submissive and patient while here on earth, and to take comfort in the hope of a heavenly reward. But those who live by the labour of others are taught by religion to practise charity while on earth, thus offering them a very cheap way of justifying their entire existence as exploiters and selling them at a moderate price tickets to well-being in heaven. Religion is opium for the people. Religion is a sort of spiritual booze, in which the slaves of capital drown their human images, their demand for a life more or less worthy of man.

But a slave who has become conscious of the slavery and has risen to struggle for the emancipation has already half ceased to be a slave. The modern class-conscious worker, reared by large-scale factory industry and enlightened by urban life, contemptuously casts aside religious prejudices, leaves heaven to the priests and bourgeois bigots, and tries to win a better life for himself here on earth. The proletariat of today takes the side of socialism, which enlists science in the battle against the fog of religion, and frees the workers from their belief in life after death by welding them together to fight in the present for a better life on earth.

Religion must be declared a private affair. In these words socialists usually express their attitude towards religion. But the meaning of these words should be accurately defined to prevent any misunderstanding. We demand that religion be held a private affair so far as the state is concerned. But by no means can we consider religion a private affair so far as our Party is concerned. Religion must be of no concern to the state, and religious societies must have no connection with governmental authority. Everyone must be absolutely free to profess any religion he pleases, or no religion whatever, i.e., to be an atheist, which every socialist is, as a rule. Discrimination among citizens on account of their religious convictions is wholly intolerable. Even the bare mention of a citizen's religion in official documents should unquestionably be eliminated. No subsidies should be granted to the established church nor state allowances made to ecclesiastical and religious societies. These should become absolutely free associations of likeminded citizens, associations independent of the state. Only the complete fulfilment of these demands can put an end to the shameful and accursed past when the church lived in feudal dependence on the state, and Russian citizens lived in feudal dependence on the established church, when medieval, inquisitorial laws (to this day remaining in our criminal codes and on our statute-books) were in existence and were applied, persecuting men for their belief or disbelief, violating men's consciences, and linking cosy government jobs and government-derived incomes with the dispensation of this or that dope by the established church. Complete separation of Church and State is what the socialist proletariat demands of the modern state and the modern church.

The Russian revolution must put this demand into effect as a necessary component of political freedom. In this respect, the Russian revolution is in a particularly favourable position, since the revolting officialism of the police-ridden feudal autocracy has called forth discontent, unrest and indignation even among the clergy. However abject, however ignorant Russian Orthodox clergymen may have been, even they have now been awakened by the thunder of the downfall of the old, medieval order in Russia. Even they are joining in the demand for freedom, are protesting against bureaucratic practices and officialism, against the spying for the police imposed on the "servants of God". We socialists must lend this movement our support, carrying the demands of honest and sincere members of the clergy to their conclusion, making them stick to their words about freedom, demanding that they should resolutely break all ties between religion and the police. Either you are sincere, in which case you must stand for the complete separation of Church and State and of School and Church, for religion to be declared wholly and absolutely a private affair. Or you do not accept these consistent demands for freedom, in which case you evidently are still held captive by the traditions of the inquisition, in which case you evidently still cling to your cosy government jobs and government-derived incomes, in which case you evidently do not believe in the spiritual power of your weapon and continue to take bribes from the state. And in that case the class-conscious workers of all Russia declare merciless war on you.

So far as the party of the socialist proletariat is concerned, religion is not a private affair. Our Party is an association of class-conscious, advanced fighters for the emancipation of the working class. Such an association cannot and must not be indifferent to lack of class-consciousness, ignorance or obscurantism in the shape of religious beliefs. We demand complete disestablishment of the Church so as to be able to combat the religious fog with purely ideological and solely ideological weapons, by means of our press and by word of mouth. But we founded our association, the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party, precisely for such a struggle against every religious bamboozling of the workers. And to us the ideological struggle is not a private affair, but the affair of

the whole Party, of the whole proletariat.

If that is so, why do we not declare in our Programme that we are atheists? Why do we not forbid Christians and other believers in God to join our Party?

The answer to this question will serve to explain the very important difference in the way the question of religion is presented by the bourgeois democrats and the Social-Democrats.

Our Programme is based entirely on the scientific, and moreover the materialist, world-outlook. An explanation of our Programme, therefore, necessarily includes an explanation of the true historical and economic roots of the religious fog. Our propaganda necessarily includes the propaganda of atheism; the publication of the appropriate scientific literature, which the autocratic feudal government has hitherto strictly forbidden and persecuted, must now form one of the fields of our Party work. We shall now probably have to follow the advice Engels once gave to the German Socialists: to translate and widely disseminate the literature of the eighteenth-century French Enlightenment and atheists.

But under no circumstances ought we to fall into the error of posing the religious question in an abstract, idealistic fashion, as an "intellectual" question unconnected with the class struggle, as is not infrequently done by the radical-democrats from among the bourgeoisie. It would be stupid to think that, in a society based on the endless oppression and coarsening of the worker masses, religious prejudices could be dispelled by purely propaganda methods. It would be bourgeois narrow-mindedness to forget that the yoke of religion that weighs upon mankind is merely a product and reflection of the economic yoke within society. No number of pamphlets and no amount of preaching can enlighten the proletariat, if it is not enlightened by its own struggle against the dark forces of capitalism. Unity in this really revolutionary struggle of the oppressed class for the creation of a paradise on earth is more important to us than unity of proletarian opinion on paradise in heaven.

That is the reason why we do not and should not set forth our atheism in our Programme; that is why we do not and should not prohibit proletarians who still retain vestiges of their old prejudices from associating themselves with our

Party. We shall always preach the scientific worldoutlook, and it is essential for us to combat the inconsistency of various "Christians". But that does not mean in the least that the religious question ought to be advanced to first place, where it does not belong at all; nor does it mean that we should allow the forces of the really revolutionary economic and political struggle to be split up on account of third-rate opinions or senseless ideas, rapidly losing all political importance, rapidly being swept out as rubbish by the very course of economic development.

Everywhere the reactionary bourgeoisie has concerned itself, and is now beginning to concern itself in Russia, with the fomenting of religious strife—in order thereby to divert the attention of the masses from the really important and fundamental economic and political problems, now being solved in practice by the all-Russia proletariat uniting in revolutionary struggle. This reactionary policy of splitting up the proletarian forces, which today manifests itself mainly in Black-Hundred pogroms, may tomorrow conceive some more subtle forms. We, at any rate, shall oppose it by calmly, consistently and patiently preaching proletarian solidarity and the scientific worldoutlook—a preaching alien to any stirring up of secondary differences.

The revolutionary proletariat will succeed in making religion a really private affair, so far as the state is concerned. And in this political system, cleansed of medieval mildew, the proletariat will wage a broad and open struggle for the elimination of economic slavery, the true source of the religious humbugging of mankind.

V. I. Lenin

THE TASKS OF THE YOUTH LEAGUES

From: LENIN'S SPEECH TO THE THIRD ALL-RUSSIA CONGRESS OF THE RUSSIAN YOUNG COMMUNIST LEAGUE

On October 2, 1920 Lenin addressed the Third All-Russia Congress of the Russian Young Communist League (YCL) in Moscow. He spoke of the basic tasks of the YCL and of the requirements to youth organisations in socialist states and explained in detail the principal YCL task, namely to learn communism.

The excerpt from that speech cited below elucidates the basic questions of communist morals and develops and concretises the Marxist teaching on morals as a form of social consciousness. Lenin proved that morals is inseparably linked with the interests of specific social classes and, in this connection, revealed the principal feature of communist morals, namely that it unites the working people in the struggle against all forms of exploitation and serves the victory of communist society, the most equitable society on earth.

Today, too, the basic tenets of Lenin's speech on the tasks of the YCL and on communist morals serve as guidelines for YCL activities in the USSR and for those of youth organisations in other socialist countries.

It was the task of the older generation to overthrow the bourgeoisie. The main task then was to criticise the bourgeoisie, arouse hatred of the bourgeoisie among the masses, and foster class-consciousness and the ability to unite their forces. The new generation is confronted with a far more complex task. Your duty does not lie only in assembling your forces so as to uphold the workers' and peasants' government against an invasion instigated by the capitalists. Of course, you must do that; that is something you clearly realise, and is distinctly seen by the Communist. However, that is not enough. You have to build up a communist society. In many respects half of the work has been done. The old order has been destroyed, just as it deserved, it has been turned into a heap of ruins, just as it deserved. The ground has been cleared, and on this ground the younger communist generation must build a communist society. You are faced with the task of construction, and you can accomplish that task only by assimilating all modern knowledge, only if you are able to transform communism from cut-and-dried and memorised formulas, counsels, recipes, prescriptions and programmes into that living reality which gives unity to your immediate work, and only if you are able to make communism a guide in all your practical work.

That is the task you should pursue in educating, training and rousing the entire younger generation. You must be foremost among the millions of builders of a communist society in whose ranks every young man and young woman should be. You will not build a communist society unless you enlist the mass of young workers and peasants in the work of building communism.

This naturally brings me to the question of how we should teach communism and what the specific features of our methods should be.

I first of all shall deal here with the question of communist ethics.

You must train yourselves to be Communists. It is the task of the Youth League to organise its practical activities in such a way that, by learning, organising, uniting and fighting, its members shall train both themselves and all those who look to it for leadership; it should train Communists. The entire purpose of training, educating and teaching the youth of today

should be to imbue them with communist ethics.

But is there such a thing as communist ethics? Is there such a thing as communist morality? Of course, there is. It is often suggested that we have no ethics of our own; very often the bourgeoisie accuse us Communists of rejecting all morality. This is a method of confusing the issue, of throwing dust in the eyes of the workers and peasants.

In what sense do we reject ethics, reject morality?

In the sense given to it by the bourgeoisie, who based ethics on God's commandments. On this point we, of course, say that we do not believe in God and that we know perfectly well that the clergy, the landowners and the bourgeoisie invoked the name of God so as to further their own interests as exploiters. Or, instead of basing ethics on the commandments of morality, on the commandments of God, they based it on idealist or semi-idealistic phrases, which always amounted to something very similar to God's commandments.

We reject any morality based on extra-human and extra-class concepts. We say that this is deception, dupery, stultification of the workers and peasants in the interests of the landowners and capitalists.

We say that our morality is entirely subordinated to the interests of the proletariat's class struggle. Our morality stems from the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat.

The old society was based on the oppression of all the workers and peasants by the landowners and capitalists. We had to destroy all that, and overthrow them but to do that we had to create unity. That is something that God cannot create.

This unity could be provided only by the factories, only by a proletariat trained and roused from its long slumber. Only when that class was formed did a mass movement arise which has led to what we have now—the victory of the proletarian revolution in one of the weakest of countries, which for three years has been repelling the onslaught of the bourgeoisie of the whole world. We can see how the proletarian revolution is developing all over the world. On the basis of experience, we now say that only the proletariat could have created the solid force which the disunited and scattered peasantry are following and which has withstood all onslaughts by the exploiters. Only this class can help the working masses unite.

rally their ranks and conclusively defend, conclusively consolidate and conclusively build up a communist society.

That is why we say that to us there is no such thing as a morality that stands outside human society; that is a fraud. To us morality is subordinated to the interests of the proletariat's class struggle.

What does that class struggle consist in? It consists in overthrowing the tsar, overthrowing the capitalists, and abolishing the capitalist class.

What are classes in general? Classes are that which permits one section of society to appropriate the labour of another section. If one section of society appropriates all the land, we have a landowner class and a peasant class. If one section of society owns the factories, shares and capital, while another section works in these factories, we have a capitalist class and a proletarian class.

It was not difficult to drive out the tsar—that required only a few days. It was not very difficult to drive out the landowners—that was done in a few months. Nor was it very difficult to drive out the capitalists. But it is incomparably more difficult to abolish classes; we still have the division into workers and peasants. If the peasant is installed on his plot of land and appropriates his surplus grain, that is, grain that he does not need for himself or for his cattle, while the rest of the people have to go without bread, then the peasant becomes an exploiter. The more grain he clings to, the more profitable he finds it; as for the rest, let them starve: "The more they starve, the dearer I can sell this grain." All should work according to a single common plan, on common land, in common factories and in accordance with a common system. Is that easy to attain? You see that it is not as easy as driving out the tsar, the landowners and the capitalists. What is required is that the proletariat re-educate a section of the peasantry; it must win over the working peasants in order to crush the resistance of those peasants who are rich and are profiting from the poverty and want of the rest. Hence the task of the proletarian struggle is not quite completed after we have overthrown the tsar and driven out the landowners and capitalists; to accomplish that is the task of the system we call the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The class struggle is continuing; it has merely changed its

forms. It is the class struggle of the proletariat to prevent the return of the old exploiters, to unite in a single union the scattered masses of unenlightened peasants. The class struggle is continuing and it is our task to subordinate all interests to that struggle. Our communist morality is also subordinated to that task. We say: morality is what serves to destroy the old exploiting society and to unite all the working people around the proletariat, which is building up a new, a communist society.

Communist morality is that which serves this struggle and unites the working people against all exploitation, against all petty, private property; for petty property puts into the hands of one person that which has been created by the labour of the whole of society. In our country the land is common property.

But suppose I take a piece of this common property and grow on it twice as much grain as I need, and profiteer on the surplus? Suppose I argue that the more starving people there are, the more they will pay? Would I then be behaving like a Communist? No, I would be behaving like an exploiter, like a proprietor. That must be combated. If that is allowed to go on, things will revert to the rule of the capitalists, to the rule of the bourgeoisie, as has more than once happened in previous revolutions. To prevent the restoration of the rule of the capitalists and the bourgeoisie, we must not allow profiteering; we must not allow individuals to enrich themselves at the expense of the rest; the working people must unite with the proletariat and form a communist society. This is the principal feature of the fundamental task of the League and the organisation of the communist youth.

The old society was based on the principle: rob or be robbed; work for others or make others work for you; be a slave-owner or a slave. Naturally, people brought up in such a society assimilate with their mother's milk, one might say, the psychology, the habit, the concept which says: you are either a slave-owner or a slave, or else, a small owner, a petty employee, a petty official, or an intellectual—in short, a man who is concerned only with himself, and does not care a rap for anybody else.

If I work this plot of land, I do not care a rap for anybody else; if others starve, all the better, I shall get the more for

my grain. If I have a job as a doctor, engineer, teacher, or clerk, I do not care a rap for anybody else. If I toady to and please the powers that be, I may be able to keep my job, and even get on in life and become a bourgeois. A Communist cannot harbour such a psychology and such sentiments. When the workers and peasants proved that they were able, by their own efforts, to defend themselves; and create a new society—that was the beginning of the new and communist education, education in the struggle against the exploiters, education in alliance with the proletariat against the self-seekers and petty proprietors, against the psychology and habits which say: I seek my own profit and don't care a rap for anything else.

That is the reply to the question of how the young and rising generation should learn communism.

It can learn communism only by linking up every step in its studies, training and education with the continuous struggle the proletarians and the working people are waging against the old society of exploiters. When people tell us about morality, we say: to a Communist all morality lies in this united discipline and conscious mass struggle against the exploiters. We do not believe in an eternal morality, and we expose the falseness of all the fables about morality. Morality serves the purpose of helping human society rise to a higher level and rid itself of the exploitation of labour.

To achieve this we need that generation of young people who began to reach political maturity in the midst of a disciplined and desperate struggle against the bourgeoisie. In this struggle that generation is training genuine Communists; it must subordinate to this struggle, and link up with it, each step in its studies, education and training. The education of the communist youth must consist, not in giving them suave talks and moral precepts. This is not what education consists in. When people have seen the way in which their fathers and mothers lived under the yoke of the landowners and capitalists; when they have themselves experienced the sufferings of those who began the struggle against the exploiters; when they have seen the sacrifices made to keep what has been won, and seen what deadly enemies the landowners and capitalists are—they are taught by these conditions to become Communists. Communist morality is

based on the struggle for the consolidation and completion of communism. That is also the basis of communist training, education, and teaching. That is the reply to the question of how communism should be learnt.

We could not believe in teaching, training and education if they were restricted only to the schoolroom and divorced from the ferment of life. As long as the workers and peasants are oppressed by the landowners and capitalists, and as long as the schools are controlled by the landowners and capitalists, the young generation will remain blind and ignorant. Our schools must provide the youth with the fundamentals of knowledge, the ability to evolve communist views independently; they must make educated people of the youth. While they are attending school, they must learn to become participants in the struggle for emancipation from the exploiters. The Young Communist League will justify its name as the League of the young communist generation only when every step in its teaching, training and education is linked up with participation in the common struggle of all working people against the exploiters. You are well aware that, as long as Russia remains the only workers' republic and the old, bourgeois system exists in the rest of the world, we shall be weaker than they are, and be constantly threatened with a new attack; and that only if we learn to be solidly united shall we win in the further struggle and—having gained strength—become really invincible. Thus, to be a Communist means that you must organise and unite the entire young generation and set an example of training and discipline in this struggle. Then you will be able to start building the edifice of communist society and bring it to completion.

To make this clearer to you, I shall quote an example. We call ourselves Communists. What is a Communist? Communist is a Latin word. *Communis* is the Latin for "common". Communist society is a society in which all things—the land, the factories—are owned in common and the people work in common. That is communism.

Section II

WHAT IS POLITICAL ECONOMY?

From the preceding section of this *Reader* we found out that the principal prerequisite for the existence of human society is production of means of livelihood, i.e., of the things needed to satisfy different human requirements. People manufacture such things jointly, in groups and communities. For example, to grow rice the inhabitants of many Asian countries jointly supply water to paddy fields, dig catchment ditches, and perform other irrigation work. Common labour gives rise to specific economic and production relations, i.e., those under study by political economy.

Political economy was initially developed by bourgeois scholars as a science that showed where and how private individuals and the whole of society increase their wealth.

It is nature (for instance, the fruit of wild trees, river fish, etc.) and people themselves that provide their livelihood. Society augments its wealth in producing tools of labour, food products, clothes, and many other items.

There is always a definite proprietor of the material means (hoes, seeds, machines, etc.) needed to manufacture useful things. The owners may be all the members of society, if they jointly create and appropriate vital material goods. This was the case at the outset of human society, under the primitive communal system, when communities (tribes, rural communities, patriarchal families) existed. Later, however, private owners of the means of production, for whom workers lacking those means toiled, became dominant. History knows of several antagonistic epochs, viz. the slave-owning system (slave-owning and slaves), feudalism (feudal lords and peasants dependent on them), and capitalism (the bourgeoisie and the workers).

Why and how do the capitalists enrich themselves? For the first time in political economy, a science-based answer to this question was provided by Karl Marx in his economic doctrine. The bourgeoisie grows richer because it enters into

profitable production relations with the workers, who have no means for existence. The latter offer the capitalists the only thing they have, namely their hands. The condition laid down before the workers by the capitalists is that the former must work the whole working day. Yet, it is enough for a worker to work only part-time to earn his livelihood and receive corresponding wages. The rest of the time he works for nothing, and the commodity value or surplus value he thus creates is, in fact, the source of the capitalists' wealth.

The essence of capitalist exploitation remains the same in our day, even though its forms are now different. Lenin developed Marx's economic doctrine in new historical conditions, when at the turn of the century capitalism had transformed into imperialism, to show the economic essence of imperialism, principally distinguished by the fact that monopolies (trusts, concerns, corporations, etc.), i.e., amalgamations of big capitalists, have assumed dominant positions in economics and politics. Thanks to these amalgamations, it has become easier for the bourgeoisie to profit from someone else's labour not only in their own countries, but particularly in economically underdeveloped states. The US, British, French, West German, Japanese monopolies and those of other imperialist states receive maximum profits (incomes) in enslaving and robbing the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, where they find the most advantageous conditions for enrichment, viz. cheap labour, cheap raw materials (petroleum, natural rubber, etc.), and cheap land.

Marx, Engels, and Lenin proved that capitalism is not an everlasting social system, and that it would inevitably perish because of its irreconcilable inherent contradictions, which nowadays show in periodically recurring overproduction crises, and also in monetary, food, energy, raw materials and ecological crises, in inflation (depreciation of money and price rise), and in mass unemployment involving many millions of people.

Marx, Engels, and Lenin showed that the bourgeoisie has socialised the labour of a large number of workers. Whereas before the advent of capitalism, the handicraftsman manufactured, say watches, from start to finish, all by himself, at capitalist enterprises all products are manufactured by machines and hundreds and thousands of workers. But this has given rise to the principal contradiction of capitalism, viz. the

incompatibility of its essentially social labour with private ownership of its products. Further enlargement and socialisation of machine production are none other than material prerequisites for socialism, a higher social system.

Marx, Engels and Lenin developed the foundations of socialist political economy to reveal major laws in the origin and development of socialist production. They showed that after the elimination of the system of private appropriation of products of other people's labour, in a socialist society all people would jointly own the means of production and the products of their collective labour. Society would ensure all its members continually improving living conditions and provide every worker with items of personal use in accordance with the measure of his work at public enterprises.

In summing up the initial experience of socialist construction in the USSR, Lenin developed a broad theory on the transitional period from capitalism to socialism, and substantiated the need for that period. In further developing Marx's and Engels's ideas, Lenin also revealed that it would be possible for economically backward nations to shift to socialism bypassing the capitalist stage of development.

A new word in Marxism was Lenin's economic programme of a socialist revolution and his well-grounded guidelines for the economic policy of the proletarian state in the course of socialist construction. In fact, Lenin advanced and substantiated the plan of socialist restructuring in the USSR.

Lenin's works comprehensively elucidate the issues of socialist and communist economics, namely the forms of socialist ownership of the means of production; the characteristic features of socialist organisation of labour; the fundamentals and means of economic management of the whole of society and of individual socialist enterprises; the distribution of material goods among the working people; and the laws and prerequisites for a transition to communism.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Parties of other countries now building socialism have made major contribution to development of the political economy of socialism.

This section includes extracts from major works and documents expounding the basics of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine on the economy of capitalism and socialism.

Karl Marx

From: CAPITAL

Capital is Marx's principal work, in which he investigated the capitalist way of production, discovered the economic law of motion and development of bourgeois society, and economically grounded the need for and inevitability of its replacement by a future society that would move all human civilisation towards communism. In fact, Marx devoted all his lifetime (he died in 1883) to developing his economic doctrine.

Capital consists of four volumes. Volume I (*Capitalist Production*) deeply and comprehensively reveals the essence of economic relations between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. In it, Marx expounds in detail and substantiates his labour theory of value and theory of surplus value. Volume II (*Circulation of Capital*) examines how individual capital (belonging to one person) and public capital (aggregate capital of society) move in the sphere of circulation (where commodities are exchanged for money, and money for commodities). In Volume III (*The Process of Capitalist Production As a Whole*), he studies the conversion of surplus value into profit, and of profit into average profit, and also the activity of trading and finance capital, to reveal how ground-rent (income of landowners) forms. Volume IV (*Theories of Surplus-Value*) critically analyses bourgeois political economy.

A scientific study of the capitalist way of production in *Capital* permitted to reveal the true status of the proletariat under capitalism, which subjects the former to cruel exploitation by the bourgeoisie. Marx revealed that the interests of capitalists and wage workers were irreconcilably opposed and that all the economic relationships of capitalism were historically of temporary nature. At the same time, he showed that the prerequisites for socialism are created within the depths of bourgeois society itself through the development of large-scale mechanised production, increasingly social nature of labour, formation of a revolutionary class—the modern

industrial proletariat, and the further development and aggravation of capitalist controversies. In this way, Marx elucidated the prospects for social development and the goals of the proletariat's class struggle. As a result, *Capital* became the working class' principal theoretical weapon. Cited below is the main contents of Chapter X ("The Working-Day") from Volume I of *Capital*; it explains how the capitalist enriches himself at the expense of the worker.

Also included in the material below is Chapter XXXII ("Historical Tendency of Capitalist Accumulation"), Volume I, in which Marx first of all shows how the class of wage workers had originally emerged, and how in the course of accumulation of capital (increase) capitalists combine increasing numbers of workers at their enterprises. Yet, capitalists continue to appropriate the fruit of the workers' joint labour, even though they themselves do not create material goods. As Marx predicted, general indignation over such an order of things would inevitably lead to a proletarian, socialist revolution, during which the capitalists who had profited from the labour of wage workers would be expropriated (deprived of their property), and ownership of the means of production and the results of collective labour would become the property of all the working people, precisely what happened in the USSR and other socialist countries.

In studying *Capital*, it is important to take into account that it elucidates the basic characteristics of production which today are prevalent in all capitalist countries. Only having sized up these basic characteristics can one understand Lenin's theory of imperialism and state-monopoly capitalism and get a correct idea of the essence of modern capitalism and of its novel intrinsic elements.

Chapter X

THE WORKING-DAY

SECTION I.—THE LIMITS OF THE WORKING-DAY

We started with the supposition that labour-power is bought and sold at its value. Its value, like that of all other commodities, is determined by the working-time necessary to its production. If the production of the average daily means of subsistence of the labourer takes up 6 hours, he must work, on the average, 6 hours every day, to produce his daily labour-power, or to reproduce the value received as the result of its sale. The necessary part of his working-day amounts to 6 hours, and is, therefore, *caeteris paribus*, a given quantity. But with this, the extent of the working-day itself is not yet given.

Let us assume that the line A —— B represents the length of the necessary working-time, say 6 hours. If the labour be prolonged 1, 3, or 6 hours beyond A B, we have 3 other lines:

Working-day I.	Working-day II.	Working-day III.
$A - - - B - C$	$A - - - B - - C$	$A - - - B - - - C$

representing 3 different working-days of 7, 9 and 12 hours. The extension B C of the line A B represents the length of the surplus-labour. As the working-day is A B+B C or A C, it varies with the variable quantity B C. Since A B is constant, the ratio of B C to A B can always be calculated. In working-day I, it is $\frac{1}{6}$, in working-day II. $\frac{3}{6}$. in working-day III, $\frac{6}{6}$ of A B. Since, further, the ratio surplus working-time.

determines the rate of the surplus-necessary working-time.

value, the latter is given by the ratio of B C to A B. It amounts in the 3 different working-days respectively to $16\frac{2}{3}$,

50 and 100 per cent. On the other hand, the rate of surplus-value alone would not give us the extent of the working-day. If this rate, e.g., were 100 per cent., the working-day might be of 8, 10, 12, or more hours. It would

indicate that the 2 constituent parts of the working-day, necessary-labour and surplus-labour time, were equal in extent, but not how long each of these two constituent parts was.

The working-day is thus not a constant, but a variable quantity. One of its parts, certainly, is determined by the working-time required for the reproduction of the labour-power of the labourer himself. But its total amount varies with the duration of the surplus-labour. The working-day is, therefore, determinable, but is, *per se*, indeterminate*.

Although the working-day is not a fixed, but a fluent quantity, it can, on the other hand, only vary within certain limits. The minimum limit is, however, not determinable; of course, if we make the extension line B C or the surplus-labour=0, we have a minimum limit, *i.e.*, the part of the day which the labourer must necessarily work for his own maintenance. On the basis of capitalist production, however, this necessary labour can form a part only of the working-day; the working-day itself can never be reduced to this minimum. On the other hand, the working-day has a maximum limit. It cannot be prolonged beyond a certain point. This maximum limit is conditioned by two things. First, by the physical bounds of labour-power. Within the 24 hours of the natural day a man can expend only a definite quantity of his vital force. A horse, in like manner, can only work from day to day, 8 hours. During part of the day this force must rest, sleep; during another part the man has to satisfy other physical needs, to feed, wash, and clothe himself. Besides these purely physical limitations, the extension of the working-day encounters moral ones. The labourer needs time for satisfying his intellectual and social wants, the extent and number of which are conditioned by the general state of social advancement. The variation of the working-day fluctuates, therefore, within physical and social bounds. But both these limiting conditions are of a very elastic nature, and allow the greatest latitude. So we find working-days of 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18 hours, *i.e.*, of the most different lengths.

* "A day's labour is vague, it may be long or short." ("An Essay on Trade and Commerce, Containing Observations on Taxes, &c," London, 1770, p. 73). (*Note by Marx.*)

The capitalist has bought the labour-power at its day-rate. To him its use-value belongs during one working-day. He has thus acquired the right to make the labourer work for him during one day. But, what is a working-day?*

At all events, less than a natural day. By how much? The capitalist has his own views of this *ultima Thule*, the necessary limit of the working-day. As capitalist, he is only capital personified. His soul is the soul of capital. But capital has one single life impulse, the tendency to create value and surplus-value, to make its constant factor, the means of production, absorb the greatest possible amount of surplus-labour.**

Capital is dead labour, that, vampire-like, only lives by sucking living labour, and lives the more, the more labour it sucks. The time during which the labourer works, is the time during which the capitalist consumes the labour-power he has purchased of him.***

If the labourer consumes his disposable time for himself, he robs the capitalist.****

The capitalist then takes his stand on the law of the exchange of commodities. He, like all other buyers, seeks to get the greatest possible benefit out of the use-value of his commodity. Suddenly the voice of the labourer, which had been stifled in the storm and stress of the process of production, rises:

The commodity that I have sold to you differs from the crowd of other commodities, in that its use creates value, and a value greater than its own. That is why you bought it. That which on your side appears a spontaneous expansion of capital, is on mine extra expenditure of labour-power. You and I know on the market only one law, that of the exchange of commodities. And the consumption of the commodity belongs not to the seller who parts with it, but to the buyer, who acquires it. To you, therefore, belongs the use of my daily labour-power. But by means of the price that you pay for it each day, I must be able to reproduce it daily, and to sell it again. Apart from natural exhaustion through age, &c. I must be able on the morrow to work with the same normal amount of force: health and freshness as to-day. You preach to me constantly the gospel of "saving" and "abstinence." Good! I will, like a sensible saving owner, husband my sole wealth, labour-power, and abstain from all foolish waste of it. I will each day spend, set in motion, put into action only as much of it as is compatible with its normal duration, and healthy development. By an unlimited extension of the working-day, you may in one day use up a quantity of labour-power greater than I can restore in three. What you gain in labour I lose in substance. The use of my labour-power and the spoliation of it are quite different things. If the average time that (doing a reasonable amount of work) an average labourer can live, is 30 years, the value of my labour-power, which you pay me from day to day is $\frac{1}{365 \times 30}$ or $\frac{1}{10950}$ of its total value. But if you consume it in 10 years, you pay me daily $\frac{1}{10950}$ instead of $\frac{1}{3650}$ of its total value, i.e., only $\frac{1}{3}$ of its daily value, and you rob me, therefore, every day of $\frac{2}{3}$ of the value of my commodity.

You pay me for one day's labour-power, whilst you use that of 3 days. That is against our contract and the law of exchanges. I demand, therefore, a working-day of normal length, and I demand it without any appeal to your heart, for in money matters sentiment is out of place. You may be a model citizen, perhaps a member of the Society for the

Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, and in the odour of sanctity to boot; but the thing that you represent face to face with me has no heart in its breast. That which seems to throb there is my own heart-beating. I demand the normal working-day because I, like every other seller, demand the value of my commodity.

We see then, that, apart from extremely elastic bounds, the nature of the exchange of commodities itself imposes no limit to the working-day, no limit to surplus-labour. The capitalist maintains his rights as a purchaser when he tries to make the working-day as long as possible, and to make, whenever possible, two working-days out of one. On the other hand, the peculiar nature of the commodity sold implies a limit to its consumption by the purchaser, and the labourer maintains his right as seller when he wishes to reduce the working-day to one of definite normal duration. There is here, therefore, an antinomy, right against right, both equally bearing the seal of the law of exchanges. Between equal rights force decides. Hence is it that in the history of capitalist production, the determination of what is a working-day, presents itself as the result of a struggle, a struggle between collective capital, *i.e.*, the class of capitalists, and collective labour, *i.e.*, the working-class.

Chapter XXXII

HISTORICAL TENDENCY OF CAPITALIST ACCUMULATION

What does the primitive accumulation of capital, *i.e.*, its historical genesis, resolve itself into? In so far as it is not immediate transformation of slaves and serfs into wage-labourers, and therefore a mere change of form, it only means the expropriation of the immediate producers, *i.e.*, the dissolution of private property based on the labour of its owner. Private property, as the antithesis to social, collective property, exists only where the means of labour and the external conditions of labour belong to private individuals. But according as these private individuals are labourers or not labourers, private property has a different character. The numberless shades, that it at first sight presents, correspond to the intermediate stages lying between these two extremes.

The private property of the labourer in his means of production is the foundation of petty industry, whether agricultural, manufacturing, or both; petty industry, again, is an essential condition for the development of social production and of the free individuality of the labourer himself. Of course, this petty mode of production exists also under slavery, serfdom, and other states of dependence. But it flourishes, it lets loose its whole energy, if it attains its adequate classical form, only where the labourer is the private owner of his own means of labour set in action by himself: the peasant of the land which he cultivates, the artisan of the tool which he handles as a virtuoso. This mode of production presupposes parcelling of the soil, and scattering of the other means of production. As it excludes the concentration of these means of production, so also it excludes co-operation, division of labour within each separate process of production, the control over, and the productive application of the forces of Nature by society, and the free development of the social productive powers. It is compatible only with a system of production, and a society, moving within narrow and more or less primitive bounds. To perpetuate it would be, as Pecqueur rightly says, "to decree universal mediocrity." At a certain stage of development it brings forth the material agencies for its own dissolution. From that moment new forces and new passions spring up in the bosom of society; but the old social organisation fetters them and keeps them down. It must be annihilated; it is annihilated. Its annihilation, the transformation of the individualised and scattered means of production into socially concentrated ones, of the pigmy property of the many into the huge property of the few, the expropriation of the great mass of the people from the soil, from the means of subsistence, and from the means of labour, this fearful and painful expropriation of the mass of the people forms the prelude to the history of capital. It comprises a series of forcible methods, of which we have passed in review only those that have been epoch-making as methods of the primitive accumulation of capital. The expropriation of the immediate producers was accomplished with merciless Vandalsim, and under the stimulus of passions the most infamous, the most sordid, the pettiest, the most meanly odious. Self-earned private property, that is based, so to say, on the

fusing together of the isolated, independent labouring-individual with the conditions of his labour, is supplanted by capitalistic private property, which rests on exploitation of the nominally free labour of others, *i.e.*, on wage-labour.*

As soon as this process of transformation has sufficiently decomposed the old society from top to bottom, as soon as the labourers are turned into proletarians, their means of labour into capital, as soon as the capitalist mode of production stands on its own feet, then the further socialisation of labour and further transformation of the land and other means of production into socially exploited and, therefore, common means of production, as well as the further expropriation of private proprietors, takes a new form. That which is now to be expropriated is no longer the labourer working for himself, but the capitalist exploiting many labourers. This expropriation is accomplished by the action of the immanent laws of capitalistic production itself, by the centralisation of capital. One capitalist always kills many. Hand in hand with this centralisation, or this expropriation of many capitalists by few, develop, on an ever-extending scale, the co-operative form of the labour-process, the conscious technical application of science, the methodical cultivation of the soil, the transformation of the instruments of labour into instruments of labour only usable in common, the economising of all means of production by their use as the means of production of combined, socialised labour, the entanglement of all peoples in the net of the world-market, and with this, the international character of the capitalistic régime. Along with the constantly diminishing number of the magnates of capital, who usurp and monopolise all advantages of this process of transformation, grows the mass of misery, oppression, slavery, degradation, exploitation; but with this too grows the revolt of the working-class, a class always increasing in numbers, and disciplined, united, organised by the very mechanism of the process of capitalist production itself. The monopoly of capital becomes a fetter upon the mode of production, which has sprung up and flourished

along with, and under it. Centralisation of the means of production and socialisation of labour at last reach a point where they become incompatible with their capitalist integument. Thus integument is burst asunder. The knell of capitalist private property sounds. The expropriators are expropriated.

The capitalist mode of appropriation, the result of the capitalist mode of production, produces capitalist private property. This is the first negation of individual private property, as founded on the labour of the proprietor. But capitalist production begets, with the inexorability of a law of Nature, its own negation. It is the negation of negation. This does not re-establish private property for the producer, but gives him individual property based on the acquisitions of the capitalist era: *i.e.*, on co-operation and the possession in common of the land and of the means of production.

The transformation of scattered private property, arising from individual labour, into capitalist private property is, naturally, a process, incomparably more protracted, violent, and difficult, than the transformation of capitalistic private property, already practically resting on socialised production, into socialised property. In the former case, we had the expropriation of the mass of the people by a few usurpers; in the latter, we have the expropriation of a few usurpers by the mass of the people.*

* The advance of industry, whose involuntary promoter is the bourgeoisie, replaces the isolation of the labourers, due to competition, by their revolutionary combination, due to association. The development of Modern Industry, therefore, cuts from under its feet, the very foundation on which the bourgeoisie produces and appropriates products. What the bourgeoisie, therefore, produces, above all, are its own grave-diggers. Its fall and the victory of the proletariat are equally inevitable.... Of all the classes, that stand face to face with the bourgeoisie to-day, the proletariat alone is a really revolutionary class. The other classes perish and disappear in the face of Modern Industry, the proletariat is its special and essential product... The lower middle-classes, the small manufacturers, the shopkeepers, the artisan, the peasant, all these fight against the bourgeoisie, to save from extinction their existence as fractions of the middle-class... they are reactionary, for they try to roll back the wheel of history. Karl Marx und Friedrich Engels, "Manifest der Kommunistischen Partei", London, 1848, pp. 9, 11.

Karl Marx

From: WAGES, PRICE AND PROFIT

On June 20 and 27, 1865, Karl Marx delivered a report entitled *Wages, Price and Profit* for members of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association, known as the First International. In that report, he for the first time publicly outlined the foundations of his theory of surplus value. At that time, the workers of many European countries resolutely demanded that capitalists raise their wages. But Weston, member of the International, tried to prove that the workers' struggle for greater wages was allegedly useless and unnecessary. Marx came out against this statement to give scientifically-grounded explanations of the essence of workers' wages and capitalists' incomes (profits) and of the need for the workers to pursue an incessant struggle against the capitalists for their economic and social rights.

The extract cited below explains first of all what is commodity value. In answering this question, Marx proceeded from the labour theory of value. He showed that the common property of all commodities exchanged in the market (such as wheat, silk, meat, etc.) is that they have been created by human labour. Now, if commodities cost the same, this means that the same amount of labour has been expended on them, specifically the labour which society recognises as normal and natural for most commodity producers.

The labour theory of value allowed Marx to conclude that when a worker applies to a capitalist for a job, he sells him a special commodity, namely his labour power or ability to work. In order to have constant ability to work, the worker must have the means to maintenance (food, clothes, housing, etc.) for both himself and his family, and also the cultural benefits widespread in society. The sum total of all these means and the expenditures on training the worker constitutes the cost of labour.

In his report, Marx showed that in order to earn his livelihood the worker toils only part of his working day. The rest of the time he works for the capitalist for nothing to create surplus value for the latter.

In his report, Marx revealed the sources of profit for such exploiter classes as bankers (capitalists who loan money) and landowners. He showed that the surplus value created by workers initially forms the capitalist-entrepreneur's income (profit), which the latter uses to pay back the landowner, from whom he had temporarily leased for fixed pay (rent) a plot of land (for erecting a building, or enterprise, or for farming, etc.).

Capitalist-entrepreneurs often borrow from banks money they lack with the intention to use it to appropriate the workers' labour. In due time, they return the money to the bank and pay a fixed amount of interest which is subtracted from the capitalist's income in favour of the banker involved.

This work by Marx is, in effect, an indictment against all exploiter classes, namely capitalist-entrepreneurs, landowners, and bankers, all of whom profit at the expense of the unpaid labour of wage workers.

VI [VALUE AND LABOUR]

Citizens, I have now arrived at a point where I must enter upon the real development of the question. I cannot promise to do this in a very satisfactory way, because to do so I should be obliged to go over the whole field of political economy. I can, as the French would say, but effleurer la question, touch upon the main points.

The first question we have to put is: What is the *value* of a commodity; How is it determined?

At first sight it would seem that the value of a commodity is a thing quite *relative*, and not to be settled without considering one commodity in its relations to all other commodities. In fact, in speaking of the value, the value in exchange of a commodity, we mean the proportional quantities in which it exchanges with all other commodities. But then arises the question: How are the proportions in which commodities exchange with each other regulated?

We know from experience that these proportions vary infinitely. Taking one single commodity, wheat, for instance, we shall find that a quarter of wheat exchanges in almost countless variations of proportion with different commodities. Yet, *its value remaining always the same*, whether expressed in silk, gold, or any other commodity, it must be something distinct from, and independent of, these *different rates of exchange* with different articles. It must be possible to express, in a very different form, these various equations with various commodities.

Besides, if I say a quarter of wheat exchanges with iron in a certain proportion, or the value of a quarter of wheat is expressed in a certain amount of iron, I say that the value of wheat and its equivalent in iron are equal to *some third thing*, which is neither wheat nor iron, because I suppose them to express the same magnitude in two different shapes. Either of them, the wheat or the iron, must, therefore, independently of the other, be reducible to this third thing which is their common measure.

To elucidate this point I shall recur to a very simple geometrical illustration. In comparing the areas of triangles of all possible forms and magnitudes, or comparing triangles with rectangles, or any other rectilinear figure, how do we proceed? We reduce the area of any triangle whatever to an expression quite different from its visible form. Having found from the nature of the triangle that its area is equal to half the product of its base by its height, we can then compare the different values of all sorts of triangles, and of all rectilinear figures whatever, because all of them may be resolved into a certain number of triangles.

The same mode of procedure must obtain with the values of commodities. We must be able to reduce all of them to an expression common to all, distinguishing them only by the proportions in which they contain that identical measure.

As the *exchangeable values* of commodities are only *social functions* of those things, and have nothing at all to do with their *natural qualities*, we must first ask, What is the common *social substance* of all commodities? It is *Labour*. To produce a commodity a certain amount of labour must be bestowed upon it, or worked up in it. And I say not only *Labour*, but *social Labour*. A man who produces an article for his own immediate use, to consume it himself, creates a *product*, but not a *commodity*. As a self-sustaining producer he has nothing to do with society. But to produce a *commodity*, a man must not only produce an article satisfying some *social want*, but his labour itself must form part and parcel of the total sum of labour expended by society. It must be subordinate to the *Division of Labour within Society*. It is nothing without the other divisions of labour, and on its part is required to *integrate* them.

If we consider *commodities as values*, we consider them exclusively under the single aspect of *realised, fixed*, or, if you like, *crystallised social labour*. In this respect they can *differ* only by representing greater or smaller quantities of labour, as, for example, a greater amount of labour may be worked up in a silken handkerchief than in a brick. But how does one measure *quantities of labour*? By the *time the labour lasts*, in measuring the labour by the hour, the day, etc. Of course, to apply this measure, all sorts of labour are reduced to average or simple labour as their unit.

We arrive, therefore, at this conclusion. A commodity has a value, because it is a *crystallisation of social labour*. The greatness of its value, of its *relative value*, depends upon the greater or less amount of that social substance contained in it; that is to say, on the relative mass of labour necessary for its production. The *relative values of commodities* are, therefore, determined by the *respective quantities or amounts of labour, worked up, realised, fixed in them*. The *correlative quantities of commodities* which can be produced in the *same time of labour* are *equal*. Or the value of one commodity is to the value of another commodity as the quantity of labour fixed in the one is to the quantity of labour fixed in the other...

It might seem that if the value of a commodity is determined by the *quantity of labour bestowed upon its production*, the lazier a man, or the clumsier a man, the more valuable his commodity, because the greater the time of labour required for finishing the commodity. This, however, would be a sad mistake. You will recollect that I used the word "*Social labour*", and many points are involved in this qualification of "*Social*." In saying that the value of a commodity is determined by the *quantity of labour worked up* or crystallised in it, we mean *the quantity of labour necessary* for its production in a given state of society, under certain social average conditions of production, with a given social average intensity, and average skill of the labour employed. When, in England, the power-loom came to compete with the hand-loom, only one half of the former time of labour was wanted to convert a given amount of yarn into a yard of cotton or cloth. The poor hand-loom weaver now worked seventeen or eighteen hours daily, instead of the nine or ten hours he had worked before. Still the product of twenty hours of his labour represented now only ten social hours of labour, or ten hours of labour socially necessary for the conversion of a certain amount of yarn into textile stuffs. His product of twenty hours had, therefore, no more value than his former product of ten hours.

If then the quantity of socially necessary labour realised in commodities regulates their exchangeable values, every increase in the quantity of labour wanted for the production of a commodity must augment its value, as every diminution must lower it.

If the respective quantities of labour necessary for the production of the respective commodities remained constant, their relative values also would be constant. But such is not the case. The quantity of labour necessary for the production of a commodity changes continuously with the changes in the productive powers of the labour employed. The greater the productive powers of labour, the more produce is finished in a given time of labour; and the smaller the productive powers of labour, the less produce is finished in the same time. If, for example, in the progress of population it should become necessary to cultivate less fertile soils, the same amount of produce would be only attainable by a greater amount of labour spent, and the value of agricultural produce would consequently rise. On the other hand, if with the modern means of production, a single spinner converts into yarn, during one working day, many thousand times the amount of cotton which he could have spun during the same time with the spinning wheel, it is evident that every single pound of cotton will absorb many thousand times less of spinning labour than it did before, and, consequently, the value added by spinning to every single pound of cotton will be a thousand times less than before. The value of yarn will sink accordingly.

Apart from the different natural energies and acquired working abilities of different peoples, the productive powers of labour must principally depend:

Firstly. Upon the *natural* conditions of labour, such as fertility of soil, mines, and so forth;

Secondly. Upon the progressive improvement of the *Social Powers of Labour*, such as are derived from production on a grand scale, concentration of capital and combination of labour, subdivision of labour, machinery, improved methods, appliance of chemical and other natural agencies, shortening of time and space by means of communication and transport, and every other contrivance by which science presses natural agencies into the service of labour, and by which the social or co-operative character of labour is developed. The greater the productive powers of labour, the less labour is bestowed upon a given amount of produce; hence the smaller the value of this produce. The smaller the productive powers of labour, the more labour is bestowed upon the same amount of

produce; hence the greater its value. As a general law we may, therefore, set it down that:—

The values of commodities are directly as the time of labour employed in their production, and are inversely as the productive powers of the labour employed.

Having till now only spoken of *Value*, I shall add a few words about *Price*, which is a peculiar form assumed by value.

Price, taken by itself, is nothing but the *monetary expression of value*. The values of all commodities of this country, for example, are expressed in gold prices, while on the Continent they are mainly expressed in silver prices. The value of gold or silver, like that of all other commodities, is regulated by the quantity of labour necessary for getting them. You exchange a certain amount of your national products, in which a certain amount of your national labour is crystallised, for the produce of the gold and silver producing countries, in which a certain quantity of *their* labour is crystallised. It is in this way, in fact by barter, that you learn to express in gold and silver the values of all commodities, that is, the respective quantities of labour bestowed upon them. Looking somewhat closer into the *monetary expression of value*, or what comes to the same, the conversion of value into price, you will find that it is a process by which you give to the *values of all commodities* an *independent* and *homogeneous form*, or by which you express them as quantities of equal social labour. So far as it is but the *monetary expression of value*, price has been called *natural price* by Adam Smith, "*prix nécessaire*" by the French physiocrats.

What then is the relation between *value* and *market prices*, or between *natural prices* and *market prices*? You all know that the *market price* is the *same* for all commodities of the same kind, however the conditions of production may differ for the individual producers. The market price expresses only the *average amount of social labour* necessary, under the average conditions of production, to supply the market with a certain mass of a certain article. It is calculated upon the whole lot of a commodity of a certain description.

So far the *market price* of a commodity coincides with its *value*. On the other hand, the oscillations of market prices,

rising now over, sinking now under the value or natural price, depend upon the fluctuations of supply and demand. The deviations of market prices from values are continual, but as Adam Smith says:

"The natural price ... is the central price, to which the prices of all commodities are continually gravitating. Different accidents may sometimes keep them suspended a good deal above it, and sometimes force them down even somewhat below it. But whatever may be the obstacles which hinder them from settling in this centre of repose and continuance they are constantly tending towards it."*

I cannot now sift this matter. It suffices to say that if supply and demand equilibrate each other, the market prices of commodities will correspond with their natural prices, that is to say, with their values, as determined by the respective quantities of labour required for their production. But supply and demand *must* constantly tend to equilibrate each other, although they do so only by compensating one fluctuation by another, a rise by a fall, and *vice versa*. If instead of considering only the daily fluctuations you analyse the movement of market prices for longer periods, as Mr. Tooke, for example, has done in his *History of Prices*, you will find that the fluctuations of market prices, their deviations from values, their ups and downs, paralyse and compensate each other; so that, apart from the effect of monopolies and some other modifications I must now pass by, all descriptions of commodities are, on the average, sold at their respective *values* or natural prices. The average periods during which the fluctuations of market prices compensate each other are different for different kinds of commodities, because with one kind it is easier to adapt supply to demand than with the other.

If then, speaking broadly, and embracing somewhat longer periods, all descriptions of commodities sell at their respective values, it is nonsense to suppose that profit, not in individual cases, but that the constant and usual profits of different trades spring from *surcharging* the prices of commodities, or selling them at a price over and above their *value*. The

* A. Smith, *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, Vol. I, Edinburgh, 1814, p. 93. (Note by Editor.)

absurdity of this notion becomes evident if it is generalised. What a man would constantly win as a seller he would as constantly lose as a purchaser. It would not do to say that there are men who are buyers without being sellers, or consumers without being producers. What these people pay to the producers, they must first get from them for nothing. If a man first takes your money and afterwards returns that money in buying your commodities, you will never enrich yourselves by selling your commodities too dear to that same man. This sort of transaction might diminish a loss, but would never help in realising a profit.

To explain, therefore, the *general nature of profits*, you must start from the theorem that, on an average, commodities are *sold at their real value*, and that *profits are derived from selling them at their values*, that is in proportion to the quantity of labour realised in them. If you cannot explain profit upon this supposition, you cannot explain it at all. This seems paradox and contrary to everyday observation. It is also paradox that the earth moves round the sun, and that water consists of two highly inflammable gases. Scientific truth is always paradox, if judged by everyday experience, which catches only the delusive appearance of things.

VII LABOURING POWER

Having now, as far as it could be done in such a cursory manner, analysed the nature of *Value*, of the *Value of any commodity whatever*, we must turn our attention to the specific *Value of Labour*. And here, again, I must startle you by a seeming paradox. All of you feel sure that what they daily sell is their Labour; that, therefore, Labour has a Price, and that, the price of a commodity being only the monetary expression of its value, there must certainly exist such a thing as the *Value of Labour*. However, there exists no such thing as the *Value of Labour* in the common acceptance of the word. We have seen that the amount of necessary labour crystallised in a commodity constitutes its value. Now, applying this notion of value, how could we define, say, the value of a ten hours' working day? How much labour is contained in that day? Ten hours' labour. To say that the value of a ten hours' working day is equal to ten hours'

labour, or the quantity of labour contained in it, would be a tautological and, moreover, a nonsensical expression. Of course, having once found out the true but hidden sense of the expression "*Value of Labour*", we shall be able to interpret this irrational, and seemingly impossible application of value, in the same way that, having once made sure of the real movement of the celestial bodies, we shall be able to explain their apparent or merely phenomenal movements.

What the working man sells is not directly his *Labour*, but his *Labouring Power*, the temporary disposal of which he makes over to the capitalist. This is so much the case that I do not know whether by the English laws, but certainly by some Continental Laws, the *maximum time* is fixed for which a man is allowed to sell his labouring power. If allowed to do so for any indefinite period whatever, slavery would be immediately restored. Such a sale, if it comprised his lifetime, for example, would make him at once the lifelong slave of his employer.

One of the oldest economists and most original philosophers of England—Thomas Hobbes—has already, in his *Leviathan*, instinctively hit upon this point overlooked by all his successors. He says:

"*The value or worth of a man* is, as in all other things, his *price*: that is, so much as would be given for the *Use of his Power*."^{*}

Proceeding from this basis, we shall be able to determine the *Value of Labour* as that of all other commodities.

But before doing so, we might ask, how does this strange phenomenon arise, that we find on the market a set of buyers, possessed of land, machinery, raw material, and the means of subsistence, all of them, save land in its crude state, the *products of labour*, and on the other hand, a set of sellers who have nothing to sell except their labouring power, their working arms and brains? That the one set buys continually in order to make a profit and enrich themselves, while the other set continually sells in order to earn their livelihood? The inquiry into this question would be an inquiry into what the

* Th. Hobbes, "Leviathan: or, the Matter, Form, and Power of a Commonwealth, Ecclesiastical and Civil". In: The English Works, Vol. III, London, 1839, p. 76.—Ed.

economists call "*Previous, or Original Accumulation,*" but which ought to be called *Original Expropriation*. We should find that this so-called *Original Accumulation* means nothing but a series of historical processes, resulting in a *Decomposition of the Original Union* existing between the Labouring Man and his Instruments of Labour. Such an inquiry, however, lies beyond the pale of my present subject. The *Separation* between the Man of Labour and the Instruments of Labour once established, such a state of things will maintain itself and reproduce itself upon a constantly increasing scale, until a new and fundamental revolution in the mode of production should again overturn it, and restore the original union in a new historical form.

What, then, is the *Value of Labouring Power*?

Like that of every other commodity, its value is determined by the quantity of labour necessary to produce it. The labouring power of a man exists only in his living individuality. A certain mass of necessaries must be consumed by a man to grow up and maintain his life. But the man, like the machine, will wear out, and must be replaced by another man. Beside the mass of necessaries required for *his own* maintenance, he wants another amount of necessaries to bring up a certain quota of children that are to replace him on the labour market and to perpetuate the race of labourers. Moreover, to develop his labouring power, and acquire a given skill, another amount of values must be spent. For our purpose it suffices to consider only *average* labour, the costs of whose education and development are vanishing magnitudes. Still I must seize upon this occasion to state that, as the costs of producing labouring powers of different quality differ, so must differ the values of the labouring powers employed in different trades. The cry for an *equality of wages* rests, therefore, upon a mistake, is an *insane* wish never to be fulfilled. It is an offspring of that false and superficial radicalism that accepts premises and tries to evade conclusions. Upon the basis of the wages system the value of labouring power is settled like that of every other commodity; and as different kinds of labouring power have different values, or require different quantities of labour for their production, they *must* fetch different prices in the labour market. To clamour for *equal* or even *equitable retribution* on

the basis of the wages system is the same as to clamour for freedom on the basis of the slavery system. What you think just or equitable is out of the question. The question is: What is necessary and unavoidable with a given system of production?

After what has been said, it will be seen that the *value of labouring power* is determined by the *value of the necessaries* required to produce, develop, maintain, and perpetuate the labouring power.

VIII PRODUCTION OF SURPLUS VALUE

Now suppose that the average amount of the daily necessities of a labouring man require *six hours of average labour* for their production. Suppose, moreover, six hours of average labour to be also realised in a quantity of gold equal to 3s. Then 3s. would be the *Price*, or the monetary expression of the *Daily Value* of that man's *Labouring Power*. If he worked daily six hours he would daily produce a value sufficient to buy the average amount of his daily necessities, or to maintain himself as a labouring man.

But our man is a wages labourer. He must, therefore, sell his labouring power to a capitalist. If he sells it at 3s. daily, or 18s. weekly, he sells it at its value. Suppose him to be a spinner. If he works six hours daily he will add to the cotton a value of 3s. daily. This value, daily added by him, would be an exact equivalent for the wages, or the price of his labouring power, received daily. But in that case *no surplus value* or *surplus produce* whatever would go to the capitalist. Here, then, we come to the rub.

In buying the labouring power of the workman, and paying its value, the capitalist, like every other purchaser, has acquired the right to consume or use the commodity bought. You consume or use the labouring power of a man by making him work as you consume or use a machine by making it run. By paying the daily or weekly value of the labouring power of the workman, the capitalist has, therefore, acquired the right to use or make that labouring power work during the *whole day or week*. The working day or the working week has, of course, certain limits, but those we shall afterwards look more closely at.

For the present I want to turn your attention to one decisive point.

The *value* of the labouring power is determined by the quantity of labour necessary to maintain or reproduce it, but the *use* of the labouring power is only limited by the active energies and physical strength of the labourer. The daily or weekly *value* of the labouring power is quite distinct from the daily or weekly exercise of that power, the same as the food a horse wants and the time it can carry the horseman are quite distinct. The quantity of labour by which the *value* of the workman's labouring power is limited forms by no means a limit to the quantity of labour which his labouring power is apt to perform. Take the example of our spinner. We have seen that, to daily reproduce his labouring power, he must daily reproduce a value of three shillings, which he will do by working six hours daily. But this does not disable him from working ten or twelve or more hours a day. But by paying the daily or weekly *value* of the spinner's labouring power, the capitalist has acquired the right of using that labouring power during *the whole day or week*. He will, therefore, make him work say, daily, *twelve* hours. *Over and above* the six hours required to replace his wages, or the value of his labouring power, he will, therefore, have to work *six other hours*, which I shall call hours of *surplus labour*, which surplus labour will realise itself in a *surplus value* and a *surplus produce*. If our spinner, for example, by his daily labour of six hours, added three shillings' value to the cotton, a value forming an exact equivalent to his wages, he will, in twelve hours, add six shillings' worth to the cotton, and produce a *proportional surplus of yarn*. As he has sold his labouring power to the capitalist, the whole value or produce created by him belongs to the capitalist, the owner *pro tem.* of his labouring power. By advancing three shillings, the capitalist will, therefore, realise a value of six shillings, because, advancing a value in which six hours of labour are crystallised, he will receive in return a value in which twelve hours of labour are crystallised. By repeating this same process daily, the capitalist will daily advance three shillings and daily pocket six shillings, one-half of which will go to pay wages anew, and the other half of which will form *surplus value*, for which the capitalist pays no equivalent. It is this *sort of exchange between capital*

and labour upon which capitalistic production, or the wages system, is founded, and which must constantly result in reproducing the working man as a working man, and the capitalist as a capitalist.

The rate of surplus value, all other circumstances remaining the same, will depend on the proportion between that part of the working day necessary to reproduce the value of the labouring power and the *surplus time* or *surplus labour* performed for the capitalist. It will, therefore, depend on the *ratio in which the working day is prolonged over and above that extent*, by working which the working man would only reproduce the value of his labouring power, or replace his wages.

.IX VALUE OF LABOUR

We must now return to the expression, "Value, or Price of Labour".

We have seen that, in fact, it is only the value of the labouring power, measured by the values of commodities necessary for its maintenance. But since the workman receives his wages *after* his labour is performed, and knows, moreover, that what he actually gives to the capitalist is his labour, the value or price of his labouring power necessarily appears to him as the *price or value of his labour itself*. If the price of his labouring power is three shillings, in which six hours of labour are realised, and if he works twelve hours, he necessarily considers these three shillings as the value or price of twelve hours of labour, although these twelve hours of labour realise themselves in a value of six shillings. A double consequence flows from this.

Firstly. *The value or price of the labouring power takes the semblance of the price or value of labour itself*, although, strictly speaking, value and price of labour are senseless terms.

Secondly. Although one part only of the workman's daily labour is *paid*, while the other part is *unpaid*, and while that unpaid or surplus labour constitutes exactly the fund out of which *surplus value or profit* is formed, it seems as if the aggregate labour was paid labour.

This false appearance distinguishes *wages labour* from other

historical forms of labour. On the basis of the wages system even the *unpaid* labour seems to be *paid* labour. With the *slave*, on the contrary, even that part of his labour which is paid appears to be unpaid. Of course, in order to work the slave must live, and one part of his working day goes to replace the value of his own maintenance. But since no bargain is struck between him and his master, and no acts of selling and buying are going on between the two parties, all his labour seems to be given away for nothing.

Take, on the other hand, the peasant serf, such as he, I might say, until yesterday existed in the whole East of Europe. This peasant worked, for example, three days for himself on his own field or the field allotted to him, and the three subsequent days he performed compulsory and gratuitous labour on the estate of his lord. Here, then, the paid and unpaid parts of labour were sensibly separated, separated in time and space; and our Liberals overflowed with moral indignation at the preposterous notion of making a man work for nothing.

In point of fact, however, whether a man works three days of the week for himself on his own field and three days for nothing on the estate of his lord, or whether he works in the factory or the workshop six hours daily for himself and six for his employer, comes to the same, although in the latter case the paid and unpaid portions of labour are inseparably mixed up with each other and the nature of the whole transaction is completely masked by the *intervention of a contract* and the *pay* received at the end of the week. The gratuitous labour appears to be voluntarily given in the one instance, and to be compulsory in the other. That makes all the difference.

In using the expression, "*value of labour*," I shall only use it as a popular slang term for "*value of labouring power*."

X PROFIT IS MADE BY SELLING A COMMODITY AT ITS VALUE

Suppose an average hour of labour to be realised in a value equal to sixpence, or twelve average hours of labour to be realised in six shillings. Suppose, further, the value of labour to be three shillings or the produce of six hours' labour. If,

then, in the raw material, machinery, and so forth, used up in a commodity, twenty-four hours of average labour were realised, its value would amount to twelve shillings. If, moreover, the workman employed by the capitalist added twelve hours of labour to those means of production, these twelve hours would be realised in an additional value of six shillings. The *total value of the product* would, therefore, amount to thirty-six hours of realised labour, and be equal to eighteen shillings. But as the value of labour, or the wages paid to the workman, would be three shillings only, no equivalent would have been paid by the capitalist for the six hours of surplus labour worked by the workman, and realised in the value of the commodity. By selling this commodity at its value for eighteen shillings, the capitalist would, therefore, realise a value of three shillings, for which he had paid no equivalent. These three shillings would constitute the surplus value or profit pocketed by him. The capitalist would consequently realise the profit of three shillings, not by selling his commodity at a price *over and above* its value, but by selling it *at its real value*.

The value of a commodity is determined by the *total quantity of labour* contained in it. But part of that quantity of labour is realised in a value for which an equivalent has been paid in the form of wages; part of it is realised in a value for which *no* equivalent has been paid. Part of the labour contained in the commodity is *paid* labour; part is *unpaid* labour. By selling, therefore, the commodity *at its value*, that is, as the crystallisation of the *total quantity of labour* bestowed upon it, the capitalist must necessarily sell it at a profit. He sells not only what has cost him an equivalent, but he sells also what has cost him nothing, although it has cost his workman labour. The cost of the commodity to the capitalist and its real cost are different things. I repeat, therefore, that normal and average profits are made by selling commodities not *above* but *at their real values*.

XI THE DIFFERENT PARTS INTO WHICH SURPLUS VALUE IS DECOMPOSED

The *surplus value*, or that part of the total value of the commodity in which the *surplus labour* or *unpaid labour* of the working man is realised, I call *Profit*. The whole of that profit is not pocketed by the employing capitalist. The monopoly of land enables the landlord to take one part of that *surplus value*, under the name of *rent*, whether the land is used for agriculture, buildings or railways, or for any other productive purpose. On the other hand, the very fact that the possession of the *instruments of labour* enables the employing capitalist to produce a *surplus value*, or, what comes to the same, to *appropriate to himself a certain amount of unpaid labour*, enables the owner of the means of labour, which he lends wholly or partly to the employing capitalist—enables, in one word, the money-lending capitalist to claim for himself under the name of *interest* another part of that surplus value, so that there remains to the employing capitalist *as such* only what is called *industrial* or *commercial profit*.

By what laws this division of the total amount of surplus value amongst the three categories of people is regulated is a question quite foreign to our subject. This much, however, results from what has been stated.

Rent, Interest, and Industrial Profit are only *different names for different parts of the surplus value* of the commodity, or the *unpaid labour enclosed in it*, and they are *equally derived from this source, and from this source alone*. They are not derived from *land* as such or from *capital* as such, but land and capital enable their owners to get their respective shares out of the surplus value extracted by the employing capitalist from the labourer. For the labourer himself it is a matter of subordinate importance whether that surplus value, the result of his surplus labour, or unpaid labour, is altogether pocketed by the employing capitalist, or whether the latter is obliged to pay portions of it, under the name of rent and interest, away to third parties. Suppose the employing capitalist to use only his own capital and to be his own landlord, then the whole surplus value would go into his pocket.

It is the employing capitalist who immediately extracts from the labourer this surplus value, whatever part of it he may

ultimately be able to keep for himself. Upon this relation, therefore, between the employing capitalist and the wages labourer the whole wages system and the whole present system of production hinge. Some of the citizens who took part in our debate were, therefore, wrong in trying to mince matters, and to treat this fundamental relation between the employing capitalist and the working man as a secondary question, although they were right in stating that, under given circumstances, a rise of prices might affect in very unequal degrees the employing capitalist, the landlord, the moneyed capitalist, and, if you please, the taxgatherer.

Another consequence follows from what has been stated.

That part of the value of the commodity which represents only the value of the raw materials, the machinery, in one word, the value of the means of production used up, forms *no revenue* at all, but replaces *only capital*. But, apart from this, it is false that the other part of the value of the commodity *which forms revenue*, or may be spent in the form of wages, profits, rent, interest, is *constituted* by the value of wages, the value of rent, the value of profits, and so forth. We shall, in the first instance, discard wages, and only treat industrial profits, interest, and rent. We have just seen that the *surplus value* contained in the commodity or that part of its value in which *unpaid labour* is realised, resolves itself into different fractions, bearing three different names. But it would be quite the reverse of the truth to say that its value is *composed of*, or *formed by*, the *addition of the independent values of these three constituents*.

If one hour of labour realises itself in a value of sixpence, if the working day of the labourer comprises twelve hours, if half of this time is unpaid labour, that surplus labour will add to the commodity a *surplus value* of three shillings, that is, a value for which no equivalent has been paid. This surplus value of three shillings constitutes the *whole fund* which the employing capitalist may divide, in whatever proportions, with the landlord and the money-lender. The value of these three shillings constitutes the limit of the value they have to divide amongst them. But it is not the employing capitalist who adds to the value of the commodity an arbitrary value for his profit, to which another value is added for the landlord, and so forth, so that the addition of these arbitrarily fixed values

would constitute the total value. You see, therefore, the fallacy of the popular notion, which confounds the *decomposition* of a given value into three parts, with the *formation* of that value by the addition of three *independent* values, thus converting the aggregate value, from which rent, profit, and interest are derived, into an arbitrary magnitude.

Frederick Engels

From: ANTI-DÜHRING

Engels's work, ironically titled *Herr Eugen Dührings' Revolution in Science*, better known as *Anti-Dühring*, was written in 1876-1879. In it, Engels criticised the views of Dühring, German petty-bourgeois ideologist, who regarded society as a mechanical sum of separately taken individuals, and explained social relations by the theory of violence. At the same time, Engels comprehensively outlined the essence of the three component parts of Marxism, viz. dialectical and historical materialism, political economy, and scientific socialism.

Cited below from *Anti-Dühring* is Chapter II ("Theoretical") of Part III (*Socialism*), where Engels noted that scientific socialism rests on a materialist understanding of history and on the conclusions of Marx's economic doctrine, which exposed the basic contradiction of capitalism, namely between the social character of production and the private capitalist appropriation of the products of labour.

In *Anti-Dühring*, Engels showed how this basic contradiction of capitalism manifests itself and how it is finally resolved. That contradiction comes out as a clash between the organisation of production at every capitalist enterprise and spontaneous, uncontrollable development of social economy as a whole. It results in economic crises, inflation, unemployment, and in a decline in the working class' living standards, and on the whole in irreconcilable opposition of bourgeois and proletarian interests, in a class struggle which may be resolved only through socialist revolution, during which the proletariat would take state power into its hands to turn the means of production (the material prerequisites of proletarian labour) into the property of the whole of society.

Anti-Dühring contains a scientifically-grounded forecast of socialist remaking of society. It substantiates the objective need in social ownership based on the social nature of production. Under socialism, the economy would function

according to a uniform plan, i.e., the work of all people would be preplanned by society to envisage the targets, essence, methods and dates for fulfilling all the tasks involved. The production of consumer goods would be rapidly increased to provide complete welfare and all-round development of all members of society. From the heavy burden that labour used to be under capitalism it would gradually turn into a primary vital need for every man. The difference between mental and manual labour, between town and countryside, so inherent in bourgeois society, would disappear. Subsequently, all class distinctions between people (with regard to their standing in economic activities, participation in organisation of production, and in distribution of material goods) would be eliminated, and, hence, in a communist society there would be no need for state authority.

In contrast to what they were under capitalism, in socialist countries all social relations and views have essentially changed to make collectivism and concern for one's fellow men the determining factors.

II**THEORETICAL**

The materialist conception of history starts from the proposition that the production [of the means to support human life] and, next to production, the exchange of things produced, is the basis of all social structure; that in every society that has appeared in history, the manner in which wealth is distributed and society divided into classes or orders is dependent upon what is produced, how it is produced, and how the products are exchanged. From this point of view the final causes of all social changes and political revolutions are to be sought, not in men's brains, not in man's better insight into eternal truth and justice, but in changes in the modes of production and exchange. They are to be sought, not in the *philosophy*, but in the *economics* of each particular epoch. The growing perception that existing social institutions are unreasonable and unjust, that reason has become unreason, and right wrong,* is only proof that in the modes of production and exchange changes have silently taken place with which the social order, adapted to earlier economic conditions, is no longer in keeping. From this it also follows that the means of getting rid of the incongruities that have been brought to light must also be present, in a more or less developed condition, within the changed modes of production themselves. These means are not to be *invented*, spun out of the head, but *discovered* with the aid of the head in the existing material facts of production.

What, is, then, the position of modern socialism in this connection?

The present structure of society—this is now pretty generally conceded—is the creation of the ruling class of today, of the bourgeoisie. The mode of production peculiar to the bourgeoisie, known, since Marx, as the capitalist mode of production, was incompatible with the local privileges and the

Mephistopheles in Goethe's *Faust*, Part I, Scene 4.—Ed.

privileges of estate as well as with the reciprocal personal ties of the feudal system. The bourgeoisie broke up the feudal system and built upon its ruins the capitalist order of society, the kingdom of free competition, of personal liberty, of the equality, before the law, of all commodity owners, of all the rest of the capitalist blessings. Thenceforward the capitalist mode of production could develop in freedom. Since steam, machinery, and the making of machines by machinery transformed the older manufacture into modern industry, the productive forces evolved under the guidance of the bourgeoisie developed with a rapidity and in a degree unheard of before. But just as the older manufacture, in its time, and handicraft, becoming more developed under its influence, had come into collision with the feudal trammels of the guilds, so now modern industry, in its more complete development, comes into collision with the bounds within which the capitalistic mode of production holds it confined. The new productive forces have already outgrown the capitalistic mode of using them. And this conflict between productive forces and modes of production is not a conflict engendered in the mind of man, like that between original sin and divine justice. It exists, in fact, objectively, outside us, independently of the will and actions even of the men that have brought it on. Modern socialism is nothing but the reflex, in thought, of this conflict in fact; its ideal reflection in the minds, first, of the class directly suffering under it, the working class.

Now, in what does this conflict consist?

Before capitalistic production, i.e., in the Middle Ages, the system of petty industry obtained generally, based upon the private property of the labourers in their means of production; [in the country,] the agriculture of the small peasant, freeman or serf; in the towns, the handicrafts [organised in guilds]. The instruments of labour—land, agricultural implements, the workshop, the tool—were the instruments of labour of single individuals, adapted for the use of one worker, and, therefore, of necessity, small, dwarfish, circumscribed. But, for this very reason they belonged, as a rule, to the producer himself. To concentrate these scattered, limited means of production, to enlarge them, to turn them into the powerful levers of production of the present day—this was precisely the historic role of capitalist production and of its upholder.

the bourgeoisie. In the fourth section of *Capital* Marx has explained in detail, how since the fifteenth century this has been historically worked out through the three phases of simple co-operation, manufacture and modern industry. But the bourgeoisie, as is also shown there, could not transform these puny means of production into mighty productive forces without transforming them, at the same time, from means of production of the individual into *social* means of production only workable by a *collectivity of men*. The spinning-wheel, the hand-loom, the blacksmith's hammer, were replaced by the spinning-machine, the power-loom, the steam-hammer; the individual workshop by the factory implying the co-operation of hundreds and thousands of workmen. In like manner, production itself changed from a series of individual into a series of social acts, and the products from individual to social products. The yarn, the cloth, the metal articles that now came out of the factory were the joint product of many workers, through whose hands they had successively to pass before they were ready. No one person could say of them: "I made that; this is *my* product."

But where, in a given society, the fundamental form of production is that spontaneous division of labour [which creeps in gradually and not upon any preconceived plan], there the products take on the form of *commodities* whose mutual exchange, buying and selling, enable the individual producers to satisfy their manifold wants. And this was the case in the Middle Ages. The peasant, e.g., sold to the artisan agricultural products and bought from him the products of handicraft. Into this society of individual producers, of commodity producers, the new mode of production thrust itself. In the midst of the old division of labour, grown up spontaneously and upon *no definite plan*, which had governed the whole of society, now arose division of labour upon a *definite plan*, as organised in the factory; side by side with *individual* production appeared *social* production. The products of both were sold in the same market, and, therefore, at prices at least approximately equal. But organisation upon a *definite plan* was stronger than spontaneous division of labour. The factories working with the combined social forces of a *collectivity of individuals* produced their commodities far more cheaply than the individual small producers. Individual

production succumbed in one department after another. Socialised production revolutionised all the old methods of production. But its revolutionary character was, at the same time, so little recognised that it was, on the contrary, introduced as a means of increasing and developing the production of commodities. When it arose, it found ready-made, and made liberal use of, certain machinery for the production and exchange of commodities: merchants' capital, handicraft, wage-labour. Socialised production thus introducing itself as a new form of the production of commodities, it was a matter of course that under it the old forms of appropriation remained in full swing, and were applied to its products as well.

In the mediaeval stage of evolution of the production of commodities, the question as to the owner of the product of labour could not arise. The individual producer, as a rule, had, from raw material belonging to himself, and generally his own handiwork, produced it with his own tools, by the labour of his own hands or of his family. There was no need for him to appropriate the new product. It belonged wholly to him, as a matter of course. His property in the product was, therefore, based *upon his own labour*. Even where external help was used, this was, as a rule, of little importance, and very generally was compensated by something other than wages. The apprentices and journeymen of the guilds worked less for board and wages than for education, in order that they might become master craftsmen themselves.

Then came the concentration of the means of production [and of the producers] in large workshops and manufactories, their transformation into actual socialised means of production [and socialised producers]. But the socialised [producers and] means of production and their products were still treated, after this change, just as they had been before, i.e., as the means of production and the products of individuals. Hitherto, the owner of the instruments of labour had himself appropriated the product, because, as a rule, it was his own product and the assistance of others was the exception. Now the owner of the instruments of labour always appropriated to himself the product, although it was no longer *his* product but exclusively the product of the *labour of others*. Thus, the products now produced socially were not appropriated by

those who had actually set in motion the means of production and actually produced the commodities, but by the *capitalists*. The means of production, and production itself, had become in essence socialised. But they were subjected to a form of appropriation which presupposes the private production of individuals, under which, therefore, everyone owns his own product and brings it to market. The mode of production is subjected to this form of appropriation, although it abolishes the conditions upon which the latter rests.*

This contradiction, which gives to the new mode of production its capitalistic character, *contains the germ of the whole of the social antagonisms of today*. The greater the mastery obtained by the new mode of production over all decisive fields of production and in all economically decisive countries, the more it reduced individual production to an insignificant residuum, *the more clearly was brought out the incompatibility of socialised production with capitalistic appropriation.*

The first capitalists found, as we have said, [alongside other forms of labour,] wage-labour ready-made for them [on the market]. But it was exceptional, complementary, accessory, transitory wage-labour. The agricultural labourer, though, upon occasion, he hired himself out by the day, had a few acres of his own land on which he could at all events live at a pinch. The guilds were so organised that the journeyman of today became the master of tomorrow. But all this changed, as soon as the means of production became socialised and concentrated in the hands of capitalists. The means of production, as well as the product, of the individual producer became more and more worthless; there was nothing left for him but to turn wage-worker under the capitalist. Wage-labour, aforetime the exception and accessory, now became

* It is hardly necessary in this connection to point out that, even if the *form* of appropriation remains the same, the *character* of the appropriation is just as much revolutionised as production is by the changes described above. It is, of course, a very different matter whether I appropriate to myself my own product or that of another. Note in passing that wage-labour, which contains the whole capitalistic mode of production in embryo, is very ancient; in a sporadic, scattered form it existed for centuries alongside slave-labour. But the embryo could duly develop into the capitalistic mode of production only when the necessary historical preconditions had been furnished.

the rule and basis of all production; aforetime complementary, it now became the sole remaining function of the worker. The wage-worker for a time became a wage-worker for life. The number of these permanent wage-workers was further enormously increased by the breaking-up of the feudal system that occurred at the same time, by the disbanding of the retainers of the feudal lords, the eviction of the peasants from their homesteads, etc. The separation was made complete between the means of production concentrated in the hands of the capitalists, on the one side, and the producers, possessing nothing but their labour-power, on the other. *The contradiction between socialised production and capitalistic appropriation manifested itself as the antagonism of proletariat and bourgeoisie.*

We have seen that the capitalistic mode of production thrust its way into a society of commodity-producers, of individual producers, whose social bond was the exchange of their products. But every society based upon the production of commodities has this peculiarity: that the producers have lost control over their own social interrelations. Each man produces for himself with such means of production as he may happen to have, and for such exchange as he may require to satisfy his remaining wants. No one knows how much of his particular article is coming on the market, nor how much of it will be wanted. No one knows whether his individual product will meet an actual demand, whether he will be able to make good his costs of production or even to sell his commodity at all. Anarchy reigns in socialised production.

But the production of commodities, like every other form of production, has its peculiar, inherent laws inseparable from it; and these laws work, despite anarchy, in and through anarchy. They reveal themselves in the only persistent form of social interrelations, i.e., in exchange, and here they affect the individual producers as compulsory laws of competition. They are, at first, unknown to these producers themselves, and have to be discovered by them gradually and as the result of experience. They work themselves out, therefore, independently of the producers, and in antagonism to them, as inexorable natural laws of their particular form of production. The product governs the producers.

In mediaeval society, especially in the earlier centuries, production was essentially directed towards satisfying the wants of the individual. It satisfied, in the main, only the wants of the producer and his family. Where relations of personal dependence existed, as in the country, it also helped to satisfy the wants of the feudal lord. In all this there was, therefore, no exchange; the products, consequently, did not assume the character of commodities. The family of the peasant produced almost everything they wanted: clothes and furniture, as well as means of subsistence. Only when it began to produce more than was sufficient to supply its own wants and the payments in kind to the feudal lord, only then did it also produce commodities. This surplus, thrown into socialised exchange and offered for sale, became commodities.

The artisans of the towns, it is true, had from the first to produce for exchange. But they, also, themselves supplied the greatest part of their own individual wants. They had gardens and plots of land. They turned their cattle out into the communal forest, which, also, yielded them timber and firing. The women spun flax, wool, and so forth. Production for the purpose of exchange, production of commodities, was only in its infancy. Hence, exchange was restricted, the market narrow, the methods of production stable; there was local exclusiveness without, local unity within; the mark in the country; in the town, the guild.

But with the extension of the production of commodities, and especially with the introduction of the capitalist mode of production, the laws of commodity-production, hitherto latent, came into action more openly and with greater force. The old bonds were loosened, the old exclusive limits broken through, the producers were more and more turned into independent, isolated producers of commodities. The anarchy of social production became apparent and grew to greater and greater height. But the chief means by aid of which the capitalist mode of production intensified this anarchy of socialised production was the exact opposite of anarchy. It was the increasing organisation of production, upon a social basis, in every individual productive establishment. By this, the old, peaceful, stable condition of things was ended. Wherever this organisation of production was introduced into

a branch of industry, it brooked no other method of production by its side. Where it laid hold of a handicraft, that old handicraft was wiped out. The field of labour became a battle-ground. The great geographical discoveries, and the colonisation following upon them, multiplied markets and quickened the transformation of handicraft into manufacture. The war did not simply break out between the individual producers of particular localities. The local struggles begat in their turn national conflicts, the commercial wars of the seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries.*

Finally, modern industry and the opening of the world market made the struggle universal, and at the same time gave it an unheard-of virulence. Advantages in natural or artificial conditions of production now decide the existence or non-existence of individual capitalists, as well as of whole industries and countries. He that falls is remorselessly cast aside. It is the Darwinian struggle of the individual for existence transferred from nature to society with intensified violence. The conditions of existence natural to the animal appear as the final term of human development. The contradiction between socialised production and capitalistic appropriation now presents itself as *an antagonism between the organisation of production in the individual workshop, and the anarchy of production in society generally.*

The capitalistic mode of production moves in these two forms of the antagonism immanent to it from its very origin. It is never able to get out of that "vicious circle" which Fourier had already discovered. What Fourier could not, indeed, see in his time is that this circle is gradually narrowing; that the movement becomes more and more a spiral, and must come to an end, like the movement of the planets, by collision with the centre. It is the compelling force of anarchy in the production of society at large that more and more completely turns the great majority of men into proletarians; and it is the masses of the proletariat again who will finally put an end to anarchy in production. It is the

* A number of wars in the 17th and 18th centuries between major European countries for attaining hegemony in trade with India and America and for seizing colonial markets. Britain, having emerged victorious concentrated actually the entire world trade in its hands by the late 18th century.—Ed.

compelling force of anarchy in social production that turns the limitless perfectibility of machinery under modern industry into a compulsory law by which every individual industrial capitalist must perfect his machinery more and more, under penalty of ruin.

But the perfecting of machinery is making human labour superfluous. If the introduction and increase of machinery means the displacement of millions of manual by a few machine-workers, improvement in machinery means the displacement of more and more of the machine-workers themselves. It means, in the last instance, the production of a number of available wage-workers in excess of the average needs of capital, the formation of a complete industrial reserve army, as I called it in 1845,* available at the times when industry is working at high pressure, to be cast out upon the street when the inevitable crash comes, a constant dead weight upon the limbs of the working class in its struggle for existence with capital, a regulator for the keeping of wages down to the low level that suits the interests of capital. Thus it comes about, to quote Marx, that machinery becomes the most powerful weapon in the war of capital against the working class; that the instruments of labour constantly tear the means of subsistence out of the hands of the labourer; that the very product of the worker is turned into an instrument for his subjugation. Thus it comes about that the economising of the instruments of labour becomes at the same time, from the outset, the most reckless waste of labour-power, and robbery based upon the normal conditions under which labour functions; that machinery, the most powerful instrument for shortening labour-time, becomes the most unfailing means for placing every moment of the labourer's time and that of his family at the disposal of the capitalist for the purpose of expanding the value of his capital. Thus it comes about that the overwork of some becomes the preliminary condition for the idleness of others, and that modern industry, which hunts after new consumers over the whole world, forces the consumption of the masses at home

down to a starvation minimum, and in doing this destroys its own home market. "The law that always equilibrates the relative surplus-population, or industrial reserve army, to the extent and energy of accumulation, this law rivets the labourer to capital more firmly than the wedges of Vulcan did Prometheus to the rock. It establishes an accumulation of misery, corresponding with accumulation of capital. Accumulation of wealth at one pole is, therefore, at the same time accumulation of misery, agony of toil, slavery, ignorance, brutality, mental degradation, at the opposite pole, i.e., on the side of the class that produces *its own product in the form of capital*."^{*} And to expect any other division of the products from the capitalistic mode of production is the same as expecting the electrodes of a battery not to decompose acidulated water, not to liberate oxygen at the positive, hydrogen at the negative pole, so long as they are connected with the battery.

We have seen that the ever increasing perfectibility of modern machinery is, by the anarchy of social production, turned into a compulsory law that forces the individual industrial capitalist always to improve his machinery, always to increase its productive force. The bare possibility of extending the field of production is transformed for him into a similar compulsory law. The enormous expansive force of modern industry, compared with which that of gases is mere child's play, appears to us now as a *necessity* for expansion, both qualitative and quantitative, that laughs at all resistance. Such resistance is offered by consumption, by sales, by the markets for the products of modern industry. But the capacity for extension, extensive and intensive, of the markets is primarily governed by quite different laws that work much less energetically. The extension of the markets cannot keep pace with the extension of production. The collision becomes inevitable, and as this cannot produce any real solution so long as it does not break in pieces the capitalist mode of production, the collisions become periodic. Capitalist production has begotten another "vicious circle".

As a matter of fact, since 1825, when the first general crisis broke out, the whole industrial and commercial world,

production and exchange among all civilised peoples and their more or less barbaric hangers-on, are thrown out of joint about once every ten years. Commerce is at a standstill, the markets are glutted, products accumulate, as multitudinous as they are unsaleable, hard cash disappears, credit vanishes, factories are closed, the mass of the workers are in want of the means of subsistence, because they have produced too much of the means of subsistence; bankruptcy follows upon bankruptcy, execution upon execution. The stagnation lasts for years; productive forces and products are wasted and destroyed wholesale, until the accumulated mass of commodities finally filter off, more or less depreciated in value, until production and exchange gradually begin to move again. Little by little the pace quickens. It becomes a trot. The industrial trot breaks into a canter, the canter in turn grows into the headlong gallop of a perfect steeplechase of industry, commercial credit, and speculation, which finally, after break-neck leaps, ends where it began—in the ditch of a crisis. And so over and over again. We have now, since the year 1825, gone through this five times, and at the present moment (1877) we are going through it for the sixth time. And the character of these crises is so clearly defined that Fourier hit all of them off when he described the first as *crise pléthorique*, a crisis from plethora.

In these crises, the contradiction between socialised production and capitalist appropriation ends in a violent explosion. The circulation of commodities is, for the time being, stopped. Money, the means of circulation, becomes a hindrance to circulation. All the laws of production and circulation of commodities are turned upside down. The economic collision has reached its apogee. *The mode of production is in rebellion against the mode of exchange, the productive forces are in rebellion against the mode of production which they have outgrown.*

The fact that the socialised organisation of production within the factory has developed so far that it has become incompatible with the anarchy of production in society, which exists side by side with and dominates it, is brought home to the capitalists themselves by the violent concentration of capital that occurs during crises, through the ruin of many large, and a still greater number of small, capitalists. The

whole mechanism of the capitalist mode of production breaks down under the pressure of the productive forces, its own creations. It is no longer able to turn all this mass of means of production into capital. They lie fallow, and for that very reason the industrial reserve army must also lie fallow. Means of production, means of subsistence, available labourers, all the elements of production and of general wealth, are present in abundance. But "abundance becomes the source of distress and want" (Fourier), because it is the very thing that prevents the transformation of the means of production and subsistence into capital. For in capitalistic society the means of production can only function when they have undergone a preliminary transformation into capital, into the means of exploiting human labour-power. The necessity of this transformation into capital of the means of production and subsistence stands like a ghost between these and the workers. It alone prevents the coming together of the material and personal levers of production; it alone forbids the means of production to function, the workers to work and live. On the one hand, therefore, the capitalistic mode of production stands convicted of its own incapacity to further direct these productive forces. On the other, these productive forces themselves, with increasing energy, press forward to the removal of the existing contradiction, to the abolition of their quality as capital, to the *practical recognition of their character as social productive forces.*

This rebellion of the productive forces, as they grow more and more powerful, against their quality as capital, this stronger and stronger command that their social character shall be recognised, forces the capitalist class itself to treat them more and more as social productive forces, so far as this is possible under capitalist conditions. The period of industrial high pressure, with its unbounded inflation of credit, not less than the crash itself, by the collapse of great capitalist establishments, tends to bring about that form of the socialisation of great masses of means of production which we meet with in the different kinds of joint-stock companies. Many of these means of production and of distribution are, from the outset, so colossal that, like the railways, they exclude all other forms of capitalistic exploitation. At a further stage of evolution this form also becomes insufficient.

[The producers on a large scale in a particular branch of industry in a particular country unite in a "Trust", a union for the purpose of regulating production. They determine the total amount to be produced, parcel it out among themselves, and thus enforce the selling price fixed beforehand. But trusts of this kind, as soon as business becomes bad, are generally liable to break up, and on this very account compel a yet greater concentration of association. The whole of the particular industry is turned into one gigantic joint-stock company; internal competition gives place to the internal monopoly of this one company. This has happened in 1890 with the English alkali production, which is now, after the fusion of 48 large works, in the hands of one company, conducted upon a single plan, and with a capital of \$6,000,000.

In the trusts, freedom of competition changes into its very opposite—into monopoly; and the production without any definite plan of capitalistic society capitulates to the production upon a definite plan of the invading socialistic society. Certainly this is so far still to the benefit and advantage of the capitalists. But in this case the exploitation is so palpable that it must break down. No nation will put up with production conducted by trusts, with so barefaced an exploitation of the community by a small band of dividend-mongers.

In any case, with trusts or without,] the official representative of capitalist society—the state—will ultimately have to undertake the direction of production.* This necessity for

* I say "have to". For only when the means of production and distribution have *actually* outgrown the form of management by joint-stock companies, and when, therefore, the taking them over by the state has become *economically* inevitable, and then—even if it is the state of today that effects this—is there an economic advance, the attainment of another step preliminary to the taking over of all productive forces by society itself. But of late, since Bismarck went in for state-ownership of industrial establishments, a kind of spurious socialism has arisen, degenerating, now and again, into something of flunkeyism, that without more ado declares *all* state ownership, even of the Bismarckian sort, to be socialistic. Certainly, if the taking over by the state of the tobacco industry is socialistic, then Napoleon and Metternich must be numbered among the founders of socialism. If the Belgian state, for quite ordinary political and financial reasons, itself constructed its chief railway lines; if Bismarck, not under any economic compulsion, took over for the state the chief Prussian lines, simply

conversion into state property is felt first in the great institutions for intercourse and communication—the post office, the telegraphs, the railways.

If the crises demonstrate the incapacity of the bourgeoisie for managing any longer modern productive forces, the transformation of the great establishments for production and distribution into joint-stock companies [, trusts], and state property shows how unnecessary the bourgeoisie are for that purpose. All the social functions of the capitalist are now performed by salaried employees. The capitalist has no further social function than that of pocketing dividends, tearing off coupons, and gambling on the Stock Exchange, where the different capitalists despoil one another of their capital. At first the capitalist mode of production forces out the workers. Now it forces out the capitalists, and reduces them, just as it reduced the workers, to the ranks of the surplus population, although not immediately into those of the industrial reserve army.

But the transformation, either into joint-stock companies [and trusts], or into state ownership, does not do away with the capitalistic nature of the productive forces. In the joint-stock companies [and trusts] this is obvious. And the modern state, again, is only the organisation that bourgeois society takes on in order to support the general external conditions of the capitalist mode of production against the encroachments as well of the workers as of individual capitalists. The modern state, no matter what its form, is essentially a capitalist machine, the state of the capitalists, the ideal personification of the total national capital. The more it proceeds to the taking over of productive forces, the more does it actually become the national capitalist, the more citizens does it exploit. The workers remain wage-workers—proletarians. The capitalist relation is not done away with. It is rather brought to a head. But, brought to a head, it topples over. State ownership of the productive forces is not the solution of the conflict, but concealed within it are the

to be the better able to have them in hand in case of war, to bring up the railway employees voting cattle for the government, and especially to create for himself a new source of income independent of parliamentary votes—this was, in no sense, a socialistic measure, directly or indirectly, consciously or unconsciously. [Note by Engels.]

technical conditions that form the elements of that solution.

This solution can only consist in the practical recognition of the social nature of the modern forces of production, and therefore in the harmonising of the modes of production, appropriation, and exchange with the socialised character of the means of production. And this can only come about by society openly and directly taking possession of the productive forces which have outgrown all control except that of society as a whole. The social character of the means of production and of the products today reacts against the producers, periodically disrupts all production and exchange, acts only like a law of nature working blindly, forcibly, destructively. But with the taking over by society of the productive forces, the social character of the means of production and of the products will be utilised by the producers with a perfect understanding of its nature, and instead of being a source of disturbance and periodical collapse, will become the most powerful lever of production itself.

Active social forces work exactly like natural forces: blindly, forcibly, destructively, so long as we do not understand, and reckon with, them. But when once we understand them, when once we grasp their action, their direction, their effects, it depends only upon ourselves to subject them more and more to our own will, and by means of them to reach our own ends. And this holds quite especially of the mighty productive forces of today. As long as we obstinately refuse to understand the nature and the character of these social means of action—and this understanding goes against the grain of the capitalist mode of production and its defenders—so long these forces are at work in spite of us, in opposition to us, so long they master us, as we have shown above in detail.

But when once their nature is understood, they can, in the hands of the producers working together, be transformed from master demons into willing servants. The difference is as that between the destructive force of electricity in the lightning of the storm, and electricity under command in the telegraph and the voltaic arc; the difference between a conflagration, and fire working in the service of man. With this recognition, at last, of the real nature of the productive

forces of today, the social anarchy of production gives place to a social regulation of production upon a definite plan, according to the needs of the community and of each individual. Then the capitalist mode of appropriation, in which the product enslaves first the producer and then the appropriator, is replaced by the mode of appropriation of the products that is based upon the nature of the modern means of production; upon the one hand, direct social appropriation, as means to the maintenance and extension of production—on the other, direct individual appropriation, as means of subsistence and of enjoyment.

Whilst the capitalist mode of production more and more completely transforms the great majority of the population into proletarians, it creates the power which, under penalty of its own destruction, is forced to accomplish this revolution. Whilst it forces on more and more the transformation of the vast means of production, already socialised, into state property, it shows itself the way to accomplishing this revolution. *The proletariat seizes political power and turns the means of production in the first instance into state property.*

But, in doing this, it abolishes itself as proletariat, abolishes all class distinctions and class antagonisms, abolishes also the state as state. Society thus far, based upon class antagonisms, had need of the state, that is, of an organisation of the particular class, which was *pro tempore* the exploiting class, for the maintenance of its external conditions of production, and, therefore, especially, for the purpose of forcibly keeping the exploited classes in the condition of oppression corresponding with the given mode of production (slavery, serfdom, wage labour). The state was the official representative of society as a whole; the gathering of it together into a visible embodiment. But it was this only in so far as it was the state of that class which itself represented, for the time being, society as a whole: in ancient times, the state of slave-owning citizens; in the Middle Ages, the feudal lords; in our own time, the bourgeoisie. When at last it becomes the real representative of the whole of society, it renders itself unnecessary. As soon as there is no longer any social class to be held in subjection; as soon as class rule, and the individual struggle for existence based upon our present anarchy in production, with the collisions and excesses arising from

these, are removed, nothing more remains to be repressed, and a special repressive force, a state, is no longer necessary. The first act by virtue of which the state really constitutes itself the representative of the whole of society—the taking possession of the means of production in the name of society—this is, at the same time, its last independent act as a state. State interference in social relations becomes, in one domain after another, superfluous, and then dies out of itself; the government of persons is replaced by the administration of things, and by the conduct of processes of production. The state is not "abolished". *It dies out.* This gives the measure of the value of the phrase "a free state", both as to its justifiable use at times by agitators, and as to its ultimate scientific insufficiency; and also of the demands of the so-called anarchists for the abolition of the state out of hand.

Since the historical appearance of the capitalist mode of production, the appropriation by society of all the means of production has often been dreamed of, more or less vaguely, by individuals, as well as by sects, as the ideal of the future. But it could become possible, could become a historical necessity, only when the actual conditions for its realisation were there. Like every other social advance, it becomes practicable, not by men understanding that the existence of classes is in contradiction to justice, equality, etc., not by the mere willingness to abolish these classes, but by virtue of certain new economic conditions. The separation of society into an exploiting and an exploited class, a ruling and an oppressed class, was the necessary consequence of the deficient and restricted development of production in former times. So long as the total social labour only yields a produce which but slightly exceeds that barely necessary for the existence of all; so long, therefore, as labour engages all or almost all the time of the great majority of the members of society—so long, of necessity, this society is divided into classes. Side by side with the great majority, exclusively bond slaves to labour, arises a class freed from directly productive labour, which looks after the general affairs of society: the direction of labour, state business, law, science, art, etc. It is, therefore, the law of division of labour that lies at the basis of the division into classes. But this does not prevent this division into classes from being carried out by means of

violence and robbery, trickery and fraud. It does not prevent the ruling class, once having the upper hand, from consolidating its power at the expense of the working class, from turning its social leadership into an [intensified] exploitation of the masses.

But if, upon this showing, division into classes has a certain historical justification, it has this only for a given period, only under given social conditions. It was based upon the insufficiency of production. It will be swept away by the complete development of modern productive forces. And, in fact, the abolition of classes in society presupposes a degree of historical evolution at which the existence, not simply of this or that particular ruling class, but of any ruling class at all, and, therefore, the existence of class distinction itself has become an obsolete anachronism. It presupposes, therefore, the development of production carried out to a degree at which appropriation of the means of production and of the products, and, with this, of political domination, of the monopoly of culture, and of intellectual leadership by a particular class of society, has become not only superfluous but economically, politically, intellectually a hindrance to development.

This point is now reached. Their political and intellectual bankruptcy is scarcely any longer a secret to the bourgeoisie themselves. Their economic bankruptcy recurs regularly every ten years. In every crisis, society is suffocated beneath the weight of its own productive forces and products, which it cannot use, and stands helpless, face to face with the absurd contradiction that the producers have nothing to consume, because consumers are wanting. The expansive force of the means of production bursts the bonds that the capitalist mode of production had imposed upon them. Their deliverance from these bonds is the one precondition for an unbroken, constantly-accelerated development of the productive forces, and therewith for a practically unlimited increase of production itself. Nor is this all. The socialised appropriation of the means of production does away, not only with the present artificial restrictions upon production, but also with the positive waste and devastation of productive forces and products that are at the present time the inevitable concomitants of production, and that reach their height in the crises.

Further, it sets free for the community at large a mass of means of production and of products, by doing away with the senseless extravagance of the ruling classes of today and their political representatives. The possibility of securing for every member of society, by means of socialised production, an existence not only fully sufficient materially, and becoming day by day more full, but an existence guaranteeing to all the free development and exercise of their physical and mental faculties—this possibility is now for the first time here, but *it is here.**

With the seizing of the means of production by society, production of commodities is done away with, and, simultaneously, the mastery of the product over the producer. Anarchy in social production is replaced by systematic, definite organisation. The struggle for individual existence disappears. Then for the first time, man, in a certain sense, is finally marked off from the rest of the animal kingdom, and emerges from mere animal conditions of existence into really human ones. The whole sphere of the conditions of life which environ man, and which have hitherto ruled man, now comes under the dominion and control of man, who for the first time becomes the real, conscious lord of nature, because he has now become master of his own social organisation. The laws of his own social action, hitherto standing face to face with man as laws of nature foreign to, and dominating him, will then be used with full understanding, and so mastered by him. Man's own social organisation, hitherto confronting him as a necessity imposed by nature and history, now becomes the result of his own free action. The extraneous objective forces that have hitherto governed history pass under the control of man himself. Only from that time will man himself, with full

* A few figures may serve to give an approximate idea of the enormous expansive force of the modern means of production, even under capitalist pressure. According to Mr. Giffen, the total wealth of Great Britain and Ireland amounted, in round numbers, in

1814 to £2,200,000,000,

1865 to £6,100,000,000,

1875 to £8,500,000,000.

As an instance of the squandering of means of production and of products during a crisis, the total loss in the German iron industry alone, in the crisis of 1873-78 was given at the second German industrial Congress (Berlin, February 21, 1878), as £22,750,000. (*Note by Engels.*)

consciousness, make his own history—only from that time will the social causes set in movement by him have, in the main and in a constantly growing measure, the results intended by him. It is the humanity's leap from the kingdom of necessity to the kingdom of freedom.

V. I. Lenin

From: IMPERIALISM, THE HIGHEST STAGE OF CAPITALISM

This book was written by V. I. Lenin in 1916. In it, he further developed Marx's economic doctrine in new historical conditions, when monopoly capitalism or imperialism had superseded free-competition capitalism.

Lenin did a great service to mankind by scientifically revealing the economic essence of imperialism, a new stage of capitalism. In his book, he summed up the new events that were taking place in the economies of the principal capitalist countries (Britain, the United States, France, Germany and others) at the turn of the century: the big capitalists had joined to set up monopolies which began to produce the greater part of all goods, and sold them at high prices which they themselves had established. Lenin showed that the biggest capitalist monopolies uniting the sharks of finance capital which had emerged in industry and banking (banks are money-loaning institutions) put under its influence all the economies of bourgeois countries and began to look for new sources of enrichment.

One such source was export of capital, i.e., its investment in other countries, chiefly in Asia, Africa and Latin America, where monopolies receive higher profits by mercilessly robbing their peoples. Another source of increasing monopoly incomes is exploitation of the labour of various countries by associations of capitalists from several states (i.e., by international monopolies or transnational corporations). Finally, an important source of monopoly profit were colonies, i.e., economically backward and enslaved nations forcibly seized by the principal capitalist countries.

Lenin's book *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* consists of ten chapters. The present Reader includes the main part of Chapter X ("The Place of Imperialism in History"), in which Lenin showed the features that distinguish imperialism from the entire preceding period of capitalist development. Lenin noted that monopolies had socialised to

the maximum production in huge enterprises and large economic amalgamations, and in some countries in international corporations. This created material premises for a new social system, socialism, based on collective labour and social appropriation of the means of production.

Lenin showed that, under imperialism, the usual contradictions of capitalism were supplemented by new ones, such as the irreconcilable contradiction between imperialist states and the colonial people whom they had enslaved. As a result of greater aggravation of all the imperialist contradictions, imperialism had turned into a precursor of a socialist revolution designed to eliminate exploitation and oppression of man by man in all countries.

History has fully confirmed Lenin's assessment of the place of imperialism in social development. Socialist revolutions have triumphed in many countries, and the peoples of almost all the enslaved countries have gained political independence and destroyed colonialism they so hate to continue the struggle against economic enslavement and neocolonialism.

V. THE PLACE OF IMPERIALISM IN HISTORY

We have seen that in its economic essence imperialism is monopoly capitalism. This in itself determines its place in history, for monopoly that grows out of the soil of free competition, and precisely out of free competition, is the transition from the capitalist system to a higher socio-economic order. We must take special note of the four principal types of monopoly, or principal manifestations of monopoly capitalism, which are characteristic of the epoch we are examining.

Firstly, monopoly arose out of the concentration of production at a very high stage. This refers to the monopolist capitalist associations, cartels, syndicates and trusts. We have seen the important part these play in present-day economic life. At the beginning of the twentieth century, monopolies had acquired complete supremacy in the advanced countries, and although the first steps towards the formation of the cartels were taken by countries enjoying the protection of high tariffs (Germany, America), Great Britain, with her system of free trade, revealed the same basic phenomenon, only a little later, namely, the birth of monopoly out of the concentration of production.

Secondly, monopolies have stimulated the seizure of the most important sources of raw materials, especially for the basic and most highly cartelised industries in capitalist society: the coal and iron industries. The monopoly of the most important sources of raw materials has enormously increased the power of big capital, and has sharpened the antagonism between cartelised and non-cartelised industry.

Thirdly, monopoly has sprung from the banks. The banks have developed from modest middleman enterprises into the monopolists of finance capital. Some three to five of the biggest banks in each of the foremost capitalist countries have achieved the "personal link-up" between industrial and bank capital, and have concentrated in their hands the control of

thousands upon thousands of millions which form the greater part of the capital and income of entire countries. A financial oligarchy, which throws a close network of dependence relationships over all the economic and political institutions of present-day bourgeois society without exception—such is the most striking manifestation of this monopoly.

Fourthly, monopoly has grown out of colonial policy. To the numerous "old" motives of colonial policy, finance capital has added the struggle for the sources of raw materials, for the export of capital, for spheres of influence, i.e., for spheres for profitable deals, concessions, monopoly profits and so on, economic territory in general. When the colonies of the European powers, for instance, comprised only one-tenth of the territory of Africa (as was the case in 1876), colonial policy was able to develop by methods other than those of monopoly—by the "free grabbing" of territories, so to speak. But when nine-tenths of Africa had been seized (by 1900), when the whole world had been divided up, there was inevitably ushered in the era of monopoly possession of colonies and, consequently, of particularly intense struggle for the division and the redivision of the world.

The extent to which monopolist capital has intensified all the contradictions of capitalism is generally known. It is sufficient to mention the high cost of living and the tyranny of the cartels. This intensification of contradictions constitutes the most powerful driving force of the transitional period of history, which began from the time of the final victory of world finance capital.

Monopolies, oligarchy, the striving for domination and not for freedom, the exploitation of an increasing number of small or weak nations by a handful of the richest or most powerful nations—all these have given birth to those distinctive characteristics of imperialism which compel us to define it as parasitic or decaying capitalism. More and more prominently there emerges, as one of the tendencies of imperialism, the creation of the "rentier state", the usurer state, in which the bourgeoisie to an ever-increasing degree lives on the proceeds of capital exports and by "clipping coupons". It would be a mistake to believe that this tendency to decay precludes the rapid growth of capitalism. It does not. In the epoch of imperialism, certain branches of industry, certain strata of the

bourgeoisie and certain countries betray, to a greater or lesser degree, now one and now another of these tendencies. On the whole, capitalism is growing far more rapidly than before; but this growth is not only becoming more and more uneven in general, its unevenness also manifests itself, in particular, in the decay of the countries which are richest in capital (Britain).

In regard to the rapidity of Germany's economic development, Riesser, the author of the book on the big German banks, states: "The progress of the preceding period (1848-70), which had not been exactly slow, compares with the rapidity with which the whole of Germany's national economy, and with it German banking, progressed during this period (1870-1905) in about the same way as the speed of the mail coach in the good old days compares with the speed of the present-day automobile ... which is whizzing past so fast that it endangers not only innocent pedestrians in its path, but also the occupants of the car." In its turn, this finance capital which has grown with such extraordinary rapidity is not unwilling, precisely because it has grown so quickly, to pass on to a more "tranquil" possession of colonies which have to be seized—and not only by peaceful methods—from richer nations. In the United States, economic development in the last decades has been even more rapid than in Germany, *and for this very reason*, the parasitic features of modern American capitalism have stood out with particular prominence. On the other hand, a comparison of, say, the republican American bourgeoisie with the monarchist Japanese or German bourgeoisie shows that the most pronounced political distinction diminishes to an extreme degree in the epoch of imperialism—not because it is unimportant in general, but because in all these cases we are talking about a bourgeoisie which has definite features of parasitism.

The receipt of high monopoly profits by the capitalists in one of the numerous branches of industry, in one of the numerous countries, etc., makes it economically possible for them to bribe certain sections of the workers, and for a time a fairly considerable minority of them, and win them to the side of the bourgeoisie of a given industry or given nation against all the others. The intensification of antagonisms between imperialist nations for the division of the world increases this

urge. And so there is created that bond between imperialism and opportunism, which revealed itself first and most clearly in Great Britain, owing to the fact that certain features of imperialist development were observable there much earlier than in other countries.

V. I. Lenin

From: ON THE SLOGAN FOR A UNITED STATES OF EUROPE

In 1915, Lenin wrote the article *On the Slogan for a United States of Europe*, most of which is published below. The article shows Lenin's attitude towards the idea of an inter-state union, the United States of Europe. He indicated that, under different socio-economic conditions, such a union would socially differ and fulfil different purposes.

For instance, under imperialism, the unification of the principal capitalist states (Britain, France, etc.) in one federation would actually mean simply their agreement to divide colonies and specify the countries they intend to rob economically.

Reality has confirmed Lenin's conclusions. At present, the coalition of ten capitalist states (Britain, France, West Germany, and others) have formed the Common Market and, particularly, the NATO military bloc to fight against socialist countries and the national liberation movement, and for the partition of the non-socialist world into spheres of economic influence.

In his article, Lenin again predicted the possibility of a future United States of the World that would include free socialist nations. In our time, the first prototype of such an association is the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, a free union of socialist states, including Bulgaria, Hungary, Vietnam, the GDR, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, the USSR, and Czechoslovakia, which favours fair economic relations between all countries and opposes neocolonialism.

In his article, Lenin gave an answer to the very important question of how a socialist revolution could start under imperialism. He proceeded from the fact that the 20th century was marked by increasingly non-uniform economic and political development in various capitalist countries. This meant that a socialist revolution could not begin in all countries simultaneously. It could initially win in several or even one single state that had attained at least a medium level of capitalist development. That is what actually happened; the

first victorious socialist revolution was accomplished in October 1917 in Russia. It was followed by triumphant socialist revolutions in other countries of Europe, Asia, and Latin America to give rise to the world socialist system.

Political changes of a truly democratic nature, and especially political revolutions, can under no circumstances whatsoever either obscure or weaken the slogan of a socialist revolution. On the contrary, they always bring it closer, extend its basis, and draw new sections of the petty bourgeoisie and the semi-proletarian masses into the socialist struggle. On the other hand, political revolutions are inevitable in the course of the socialist revolution, which should not be regarded as a single act, but as a period of turbulent political and economic upheavals, the most intense class struggle, civil war, revolutions, and counter-revolutions.

But while the slogan of a republican United States of Europe—if accompanied by the revolutionary overthrow of the three most reactionary monarchies in Europe, headed by the Russian—is quite invulnerable as a political slogan, there still remains the highly important question of its economic content and significance. From the standpoint of the economic conditions of imperialism—i.e., the export of capital and the division of the world by the “advanced” and “civilised” colonial powers—a United States of Europe, under capitalism, is either impossible or reactionary.

Capital has become international and monopolist. The world has been carved up by a handful of Great Powers, i.e., powers successful in the great plunder and oppression of nations. The four Great Powers of Europe—Britain, France, Russia and Germany, with an aggregate population of between 250,000,000 and 300,000,000, and an area of about 7,000,000 square kilometres—possess colonies with a population of *almost 500 million* (494,500,000) and an area of 64,600,000 square kilometres, i.e., almost half the surface of the globe (133,000,000 square kilometres, exclusive of Arctic and Antarctic regions). Add to this the three Asian states—China, Turkey and Persia, now being rent piecemeal by thugs that are waging a war of “liberation”, namely, Japan, Russia,

Britain and France. Those three Asian states, which may be called semi-colonies (in reality they are now 90 per cent colonies), have a total population of 360,000,000 and an area of 14,500,000 square kilometres (almost one and a half times the area of all Europe).

Furthermore, Britain, France and Germany have invested capital abroad to the value of no less than 70,000 million rubles. The business of securing "legitimate" profits from this tidy sum—these exceed 3,000 million rubles annually—is carried out by the national committees of the millionaires, known as governments, which are equipped with armies and navies and which provide the sons and brothers of the millionaires with jobs in the colonies and semi-colonies as viceroys, consuls, ambassadors, officials of all kinds, clergymen, and other leeches.

That is how the plunder of about a thousand million of the earth's population by a handful of Great Powers is organised in the epoch of the highest development of capitalism. No other organisation is possible under capitalism. Renounce colonies, "spheres of influence", and the export of capital? To think that it is possible means coming down to the level of some snivelling parson who every Sunday preaches to the rich on the lofty principles of Christianity and advises them to give the poor, well, if not millions, as least several hundred rubles yearly.

A United States of Europe under capitalism is tantamount to an agreement on the partition of colonies. Under capitalism, however, no other basis and no other principle of division are possible except force. A multi-millionaire cannot share the "national income" of a capitalist country with anyone otherwise than "in proportion to the capital invested" (with a bonus thrown in, so that the biggest capital may receive more than its share). Capitalism is private ownership of the means of production, and anarchy in production. To advocate a "just" division of income on such a basis is sheer Proudhonism, stupid philistinism. No division can be effected otherwise than in "proportion to strength", and strength changes with the course of economic development. Following 1871, the rate of Germany's accession of strength was three or four times as rapid as that of Britain and France, and of Japan about ten times as rapid as Russia's. There is and there

can be no other way of testing the real might of a capitalist state than by war. War does not contradict the fundamentals of private property—on the contrary, it is a direct and inevitable outcome of those fundamentals. Under capitalism the smooth economic growth of individual enterprises or individual states is impossible. Under capitalism, there are no other means of restoring the periodically disturbed equilibrium than crises in industry and wars in politics.

Of course, *temporary agreements* are possible between capitalists and between states. In this sense a United States of Europe is possible as an agreement between the *European* capitalists ... but to what end? Only for the purpose of jointly suppressing socialism in Europe, of jointly protecting colonial booty *against* Japan and America, who have been badly done out of their share by the present partition of colonies, and the increase of whose might during the last fifty years has been immeasurably more rapid than that of backward and monarchist Europe, now turning senile. Compared with the United States of America, Europe as a whole denotes economic stagnation. On the present economic basis, i.e., under capitalism, a United States of Europe would signify an organisation of reaction to retard America's more rapid development. The times when the cause of democracy and socialism was associated only with Europe alone have gone for ever.

A United States of the World (not of Europe alone) is the state form of the unification and freedom of nations which we associate with socialism—until the time when the complete victory of communism brings about the total disappearance of the state, including the democratic. As a separate slogan, however, the slogan of a United States of the World would hardly be a correct one, first, because it merges with socialism; second, because it may be wrongly interpreted to mean that the victory of socialism in a single country is impossible, and it may also create misconceptions as to the relations of such a country to the others.

Uneven economic and political development is an absolute law of capitalism. Hence, the victory of socialism is possible first in several or even in one capitalist country alone. After expropriating the capitalists and organising their own socialist production, the victorious proletariat of that country will arise

against the rest of the world—the capitalist world—attracting to its cause the oppressed classes of other countries, stirring uprisings in those countries against the capitalists, and in case of need using even armed force against the exploiting classes and their states. The political form of a society wherein the proletariat is victorious in overthrowing the bourgeoisie will be a democratic republic, which will more and more concentrate the forces of the proletariat of a given nation or nations, in the struggle against states that have not yet gone over to socialism. The abolition of classes is impossible without a dictatorship of the oppressed class, of the proletariat. A free union of nations in socialism is impossible without a more or less prolonged and stubborn struggle of the socialist republics against the backward states.

V. I. Lenin

From: THE ORIGINAL VERSION OF THE ARTICLE THE IMMEDIATE TASKS OF THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT

The original version of the article '*The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government*' was dictated by Lenin to a stenographer on March 23-28, 1918, when the Russian working class had finally won power in the course of a socialist revolution. At that time, Lenin was preparing to discuss at the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks), now the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, his plan for starting socialist construction.

Lenin determined the major tasks of Soviet government, the tasks of the new state of Russia's workers and working peasants. In Chapters V and VI of his article, cited below, Lenin showed that those tasks consisted in the organisation of the national economy on new socialist principles. This would need to take into consideration everything produced by the state sector, and to see to it that the material goods produced by collective labour were distributed properly. Lenin believed they should be given only to those who work, proportionally to the share of the individual labour input. To raise the people's welfare, the state, all the working people should strive to increase output (productivity of labour).

As evidenced by the experience of the USSR and other socialist countries many of Lenin's tenets on the economic tasks of the socialist state remain valid for the entire period of socialist development.

Chapter V

The task of administering the state, which now confronts the Soviet government, has this special feature, that, probably for the first time in the modern history of civilised nations, it deals pre-eminently with economics rather than with politics. Usually the word "administration" is associated chiefly, if not solely, with political activity. However, the very basis and essence of Soviet power, like that of the transition itself from capitalist to socialist society, lie in the fact that political tasks occupy a subordinate position to economic tasks. And now, especially after the practical experience of over four months of Soviet government in Russia, it should be quite clear to us that the task of administering the state is primarily a purely economic task—that of healing the country's wounds inflicted by the war, restoring its productive forces, organising accountancy in and control over production and distribution, raising the productivity of labour—in short, it boils down to the task of economic reorganisation.

This task can be said to fall under two main headings: 1) accounting and control over production and distribution in the broadest, most widespread and universal forms of such accounting and control, and 2) raising the productivity of labour. These tasks can be handled by any form of collective effort or any form of state passing over to socialism only on condition that the basic economic, social, cultural and political preconditions for this have been created in a sufficient degree by capitalism. Without large-scale machine production, without a more or less developed network of railways, postal and telegraph communications, without a more or less developed network of public educational institutions, neither of these tasks can be carried out in a systematic way on a national scale. Russia is in a position when quite a number of these initial preconditions for such a transition actually exist. On the other hand, quite a number of these preconditions are absent in our country, but can be borrowed by it fairly easily.

from the experience of the neighbouring, far more advanced countries, whom history and international intercourse have long since placed in close contact with Russia.

Chapter VI

The basic aim of every society going over to a socialist system consists in the victory of the ruling class—or rather the class that is growing up to be the ruling class—namely, the proletariat, over the bourgeoisie as described above. And this task is set before us in a substantially new way, quite unlike the way it stood in the course of many decades of the proletariat's world-wide experience of struggle against the bourgeoisie. Now, after the gains of the October Revolution, after our successes in the civil war, victory over the bourgeoisie should stand for something much bigger, albeit more peaceful in form: namely, victory over the bourgeoisie, now that it has been secured politically and made good militarily, should now be achieved in the sphere of organisation of the national economy, in the sphere of organisation of production, in the sphere of country-wide accounting and control. The problem of accounting and control over production was dealt with by the bourgeoisie all the more effectively in proportion as production expanded and the network of national economic institutions embracing tens and hundreds of millions of the population of a large modern state became more ramified. We must handle this task now in a new way, backed by the predominating position of the proletariat, supported by the bulk of the working and exploited masses, making use of those elements of organising talent and technical knowledge which have been accumulated by the preceding society, and nine-tenths, perhaps even ninety-nine hundredths of which belong to a class hostile and opposed to the socialist revolution.

V. I. Lenin

From: "LEFT-WING" CHILDISHNESS AND THE PETTY-BOURGEOIS MENTALITY

Lenin published this article in 1918 to criticise the "Left Communists" on questions of the Soviet state's foreign and home policies.

The "Left Communists" were a factional group (an alienated party group advocating views that differ from those of the whole political party) within the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks). They expressed the revolutionary sentiments of the petty bourgeoisie, which denied the possibility of socialism winning in one country. The "Left Communists" believed that it would be possible to preserve the power of the working class and the gains of the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia only in case of a victorious world socialist revolution that had to be pushed by means of war against world imperialism. "Left Communists" opposed revolutionary-socialist measures in the country. They claimed that discipline in work and one-man management (subordination to production supervisor of all workers involved) at enterprises, and the use of bourgeois specialists and state capitalism (whereby the socialist state allows capitalist activity within certain limits) would allegedly signify a return to the bourgeois system. After Lenin and the Party had diatribed these views, the "Left Communists" admitted their mistakes and joined party and state work.

The extract below examines the major issues of the doctrine concerning the transitional period from capitalism to socialism, namely its essence and economic structures, the essence of state capitalism under socialist government, and the significance of the struggle against petty-bourgeois elements for adjusting state organisation of all production.

No one, I think, in studying the question of the economic system of Russia, has denied its transitional character. Nor, I think, has any Communist denied that the term Socialist Soviet Republic implies the determination of Soviet power to achieve the transition to socialism, and not that the new economic system is recognised as a socialist order.

But what does the word "transition" mean? Does it not mean, as applied to an economy, that the present system contains elements, particles, fragments of *both* capitalism and socialism? Everyone will admit that it does. But not all who admit this take the trouble to consider what elements actually constitute the various socio-economic structures that exist in Russia at the present time. And this is the crux of the question.

Let us enumerate these elements:

1) patriarchal, i.e., to a considerable extent natural, peasant farming;

2) small commodity production (this includes the majority of those peasants who sell their grain);

3) private capitalism;

4) state capitalism;

5) socialism.

Russia is so vast and so varied that all these different types of socio-economic structures are intermingled. This is what constitutes the specific feature of the situation.

The question arises: what elements predominate? Clearly, in a small-peasant country, the petty-bourgeois element predominates and it must predominate, for the great majority of those working the land are small commodity producers. The shell of our state capitalism (grain monopoly, state-controlled entrepreneurs and traders, bourgeois co-operators) is pierced now in one place, now in another by *profiteers*, the chief object of profiteering being *grain*.

It is in this field that the main struggle is being waged. Between what elements is this struggle being waged if we are to speak in terms of economic categories such as "state capitalism"? Between the fourth and the fifth in the order in which I have just enumerated them? Of course not. It is not state capitalism that is at war with socialism, but the petty bourgeoisie plus private capitalism fighting together against both state capitalism and socialism. The petty bourgeoisie oppose *every* kind of state interference, accounting and control, whether it be state capitalist or state socialist. This is an absolutely unquestionable fact of reality, and the root of the economic mistake of the "Left Communists" is that they have failed to understand it. The profiteer, the commercial racketeer, the disrupter of monopoly—these are our principal "internal" enemies, the enemies of the economic measures of Soviet power. A hundred and twenty-five years ago it might have been excusable for the French petty bourgeoisie, the most ardent and sincere revolutionaries, to try to crush the profiteer by executing a few of the "chosen" and by making thunderous declamations. Today, however, the purely rhetorical attitude to this question assumed by some Left Socialist-Revolutionaries can rouse nothing but disgust and revulsion in every politically conscious revolutionary. We know perfectly well that the economic basis of profiteering is both the small proprietors, who are exceptionally widespread in Russia, and private capitalism, of which *every* petty bourgeois is an agent. We know that the million tentacles of this petty-bourgeois hydra now and again encircle various sections of the workers, that, *instead of state monopoly*, profiteering forces its way into every pore of our social and economic organism.

Those who fail to see this show by their blindness that they are slaves of petty-bourgeois prejudices. This is precisely the case with our "Left Communists", who in words (and of course in their deepest convictions) are merciless enemies of the petty bourgeoisie, while in deeds they help only the petty bourgeoisie, serve only this section of the population and express only its point of view by fighting—in April 1918!!—against ... "state capitalism". They are wide of the mark!

The petty bourgeoisie have money put away, the few thousand that they made during the war by "honest" and especially by dishonest means. They are the characteristic

economic type that serves as the basis of profiteering and private capitalism. Money is a certificate entitling the possessor to receive social wealth; and a vast section of small proprietors, numbering millions, cling to this certificate and conceal it from the "state". They do not believe in socialism or communism, and "mark time" until the proletarian storm blows over. Either we subordinate the petty bourgeoisie to our control and accounting (we can do this if we organise the poor, that is, the majority of the population or semi-proletarians, around the politically conscious proletarian vanguard), or they will overthrow our workers' power as surely and as inevitably as the revolution was overthrown by the Napoleons and Cavaignacs who sprang from this very soil of petty proprietorship. This is how the question stands. Only the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries fail to see this plain and evident truth through their mist of empty phrases about the "toiling" peasants. But who takes these phrase-mongering Left Socialist-Revolutionaries seriously?

The petty bourgeois who hoards his thousands is an enemy of state capitalism. He wants to employ his thousands just for himself, against the poor, in opposition to any kind of state control. And the sum total of these thousands, amounting to many thousands of millions, forms the base for profiteering, which undermines our socialist construction. Let us assume that a certain number of workers produce in a few days values equal to 1,000. Let us then assume that 200 of this total vanishes owing to petty profiteering, various kinds of embezzlement and the "evasion" by the small proprietors of Soviet decrees and regulations. Every politically conscious worker will say that if better order and organisation could be obtained at the price of 300 out of the 1,000 he would willingly give 300 instead of 200, for it will be quite easy under Soviet power to reduce this "tribute" later on to, say, 100 or 50, once order and organisation are established and once the petty-bourgeois disruption of state monopoly is completely overcome.

This simple illustration in figures, which I have deliberately simplified to the utmost in order to make it absolutely clear, explains the present *correlation* of state capitalism and socialism. The workers hold state power and have every legal opportunity of "taking" the whole thousand, without giving up

a single kopek, except for socialist purposes. This legal opportunity, which rests upon the actual transition of power to the workers, is an element of socialism.

But in many ways, the small proprietary and private capitalist element undermines this legal position, drags in profiteering, hinders the execution of Soviet decrees. State capitalism would be a gigantic step forward *even if* we paid *more* than we are paying at present (I took a numerical example deliberately to bring this out more sharply), because it is worth while paying for "tuition", because it is useful for the workers, because victory over disorder, economic ruin and laxity is the most important thing; because the continuation of the anarchy of small ownership is the greatest, the most serious danger, and it will *certainly* be our ruin (unless we overcome it), whereas not only will the payment of a heavier tribute to state capitalism not ruin us, it will lead us to socialism by the surest road. When the working class has learned how to defend the state system against the anarchy of small ownership, when it has learned to organise large-scale production on a national scale, along state capitalist lines, it will hold, if I may use the expression, all the trump cards, and the consolidation of socialism will be assured.

In the first place, *economically*, state capitalism is immeasurably superior to our present economic system.

In the second place, there is nothing terrible in it for Soviet power, for the Soviet state is a state in which the power of the workers and the poor is assured.

V. I. Lenin

From: ECONOMICS AND POLITICS IN THE ERA OF THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT

Lenin wrote this article in 1919 to mark the two-year anniversary of Soviet government. It substantiates the major principles of the economics and politics of the state of the working class during the transitional period from capitalism to socialism and develops the Marxist theory on major socio-economic and political issues, such as the need in the transitional period from capitalism to socialism and the essence and basic contradiction of that period; the economic and class structure of society in that period; the dual nature of the peasantry (the peasants as working people and as private owners seeking to profit from other people's work), and the pathways for involving the peasantry in socialist construction; the objective foundations for exterminating classes; the class nature of any democracy; the dictatorship of the proletariat as an instrument for building socialism; and the common and specific features arising in the process of transition of different countries to socialism.

Lenin's article consists of five parts. Cited below are parts 1, 2 and 5. Part 1 reveals the basic essence of the transitional period from capitalism to socialism. Lenin criticises J. R. MacDonald, J. Longuet, K. Kautsky, and F. Adler (all representatives of the Second International) for forgetting the Marxist tenet that a special transitional period to socialism is objectively needed. This criticism is also valid today: contemporary reformists and revisionists discard the idea that such a period is essential; they propagate the false doctrine that capitalism would gradually regenerate into socialism without any socialist revolution and revolutionary transitional period to socialism.

In Part 2 Lenin singles out the basic forms of social economy and the principal class forces in the transition of all countries from capitalism to socialism revealing the objective foundation for the existence of the general laws governing the establishment of socialism. Lenin shows the total groundless-

ness of the attempts of bourgeois and revisionist ideologists to declare the Great October Socialist Revolution and the practice of socialist construction in Russia a departure from the general laws of social development, claiming that both are purely Russian phenomena and seeking to belittle their international significance.

In Part 5, Lenin develops and concretises Marx's and Engels' well-known tenet that socialism implies extermination of classes. He says that to resolve this problem it would first of all be necessary to overthrow the power of the exploiters, to establish the power of the working class in alliance with the working peasantry, and to overcome the difference between the workers and peasants by turning all of them into workers of a national economy of the whole people. Such are the essential milestones on the way to achieving social equality for all members of society.

As evidenced by the experience of many socialist countries, class division of society is not fully overcome during the above-said transitional period. However, it eliminates exploitation of man by man and turns all the able-bodied population into workers of socialist enterprises. This principal outcome underlies the arisal and further development of a homogeneous society, and as socialism gets more mature a classless social structure would be in the main established.

1

Theoretically, there can be no doubt that between capitalism and communism there lies a definite transition period which must combine the features and properties of both these forms of social economy. The transition period has to be a period of struggle between dying capitalism and nascent communism—or, in other words, between capitalism which has been defeated but not destroyed and communism which has been born but is still very feeble.

The necessity for a whole historical era distinguished by these transitional features should be obvious not only to Marxists, but to any educated person who is in any degree acquainted with the theory of development. Yet all the talk on the subject of the transition to socialism which we hear from present-day petty-bourgeois democrats (and such, in spite of their spurious socialist label, are all the leaders of the Second International, including such individuals as MacDonald, Jean Longuet, Kautsky and Friedrich Adler) is marked by complete disregard of this obvious truth. Petty-bourgeois democrats are distinguished by an aversion to class struggle, by their dreams of avoiding it, by their efforts to smooth over, to reconcile, to remove sharp corners. Such democrats, therefore, either avoid recognising any necessity for a whole historical period of transition from capitalism to communism or regard it as their duty to concoct schemes for reconciling the two contending forces instead of leading the struggle of one of these forces.

2

In Russia, the dictatorship of the proletariat must inevitably differ in certain particulars from what it would be in the advanced countries, owing to the very great backwardness and petty-bourgeois character of our country. But the basic forces—and the basic forms of social economy—are the same in Russia as in any capitalist country, so that the peculiarities can apply only to what is of lesser importance.

The basic forms of social economy are capitalism, petty commodity production, and communism. The basic forces are the bourgeoisie, the petty bourgeoisie (the peasantry in particular) and the proletariat.

The economic system of Russia in the era of the dictatorship of the proletariat represents the struggle of labour, united on communist principles on the scale of a vast state and making its first steps—the struggle against petty commodity production and against the capitalism which still persists and against that which is newly arising on the basis of petty commodity production.

In Russia, labour is united communistically insofar as, first, private ownership of the means of production has been abolished, and, secondly, the proletarian state power is organising large-scale production on state-owned land and in state-owned enterprises on a national scale, is distributing labour-power among the various branches of production and the various enterprises, and is distributing among the working people large quantities of articles of consumption belonging to the state.

We speak of "the first steps" of communism in Russia (it is also put that way in our Party Programme adopted in March 1919), because all these things have been only partially effected in our country, or to put it differently, their achievement is only in its early stages. We accomplished instantly, at one revolutionary blow, all that can, in general, be accomplished instantly; on the first day of the dictatorship of the proletariat, for instance, on October 26 (November 8), 1917, the private ownership of land was abolished without compensation for the big landowners—the big landowners were expropriated. Within the space of a few months practically all the big capitalists, owners of factories, joint-stock companies, banks, railways, and so forth, were also expropriated without compensation. The state organisation of large-scale production in industry and the transition from "workers' control" to "workers' management" of factories and railways—this has, by and large, already been accomplished; but in relation to agriculture it has only just begun ("state farms", i.e., large farms organised by the workers' state on state-owned land). Similarly, we have only just begun the organisation of various forms of co-operative societies of small farmers as a transition from petty commodity agricul-

ture*. The same must be said of the state-organised distribution of products in place of private trade, i.e., the state procurement and delivery of grain to the cities and of industrial products to the countryside. Available statistical data on this subject will be given below.

Peasant farming continues to be petty commodity production. Here we have an extremely broad and very sound, deep-rooted basis for capitalism, a basis on which capitalism persists or arises anew in a bitter struggle against communism. The forms of this struggle are private speculation and profiteering versus state procurement of grain (and other products) and state distribution of products in general.

5

Socialism means the abolition of classes. The dictatorship of the proletariat has done all it could to abolish classes. But classes cannot be abolished at one stroke.

And classes still *remain* and *will remain* in the era of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The dictatorship will become unnecessary when classes disappear. Without the dictatorship of the proletariat they will not disappear.

Classes have remained, but in the era of the dictatorship of the proletariat *every class* has undergone a change, and the relations between the classes have also changed. The class struggle does not disappear under the dictatorship of the proletariat; it merely assumes different forms.

Under capitalism the proletariat was an oppressed class, a class which had been deprived of the means of production, the only class which stood directly and completely opposed to the bourgeoisie, and therefore the only one capable of being revolutionary to the very end. Having overthrown the bourgeoisie and conquered political power, the proletariat has become the *ruling* class; it wields state power, it exercises control over means of production already socialised; it guides the wavering and intermediary elements and classes; it crushed the increasingly stubborn resistance of the exploiters.

All these are *specific* tasks of the class struggle, tasks which the proletariat formerly did not and could not have set itself.

The class of exploiters, the landowners and capitalists, has not disappeared and cannot disappear all at once under the dictatorship of the proletariat. The exploiters have been smashed, but not destroyed. They still have an international base in the form of international capital, of which they are a branch. They still retain certain means of production in part, they still have money, they still have vast social connections. Because they have been defeated, the energy of their resistance has increased a hundred- and a thousandfold. The "art" of state, military and economic administration gives them a superiority, and a very great superiority, so that their importance is incomparably greater than their numerical proportion of the population. The class struggle waged by the overthrown exploiters against the victorious vanguard of the exploited, i.e., the proletariat, has become incomparably more bitter. And it cannot be otherwise in the case of a revolution, unless this concept is replaced (as it is by all the heroes of the Second International) by reformist illusions.

Lastly, the peasants, like the petty bourgeoisie in general, occupy a half-way, intermediate position *even* under the dictatorship of the proletariat: on the one hand, they are a fairly large (and in backward Russia, a vast) mass of working people, united by the common interest of all working people to emancipate themselves from the landowner and the capitalist; on the other hand, they are disunited small proprietors, property-owners and traders. Such an economic position inevitably causes them to vacillate between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. In view of the acute form which the struggle between these two classes has assumed, in view of the incredible severe break-up of all social relations, and in view of the great attachment of the peasants and the petty bourgeoisie generally to the old, the routine, and the unchanging, it is only natural that we should inevitably find them swinging from one side to the other, that we should find them wavering, changeable, uncertain, and so on.

In relation to this class—or to these social elements—the proletariat must strive to establish its influence over it, to guide it. To give leadership to the vacillating and unstable—such is the task of the proletariat.

If we compare all the basic forces or classes and their interrelations, as modified by the dictatorship of the proletariat, we shall realise how unutterably nonsensical and theoretically stupid is the common petty-bourgeois idea shared by all representatives of the Second International, that the transition to socialism is possible "by means of democracy" in general. The fundamental source of this error lies in the prejudice inherited from the bourgeoisie that "democracy" is something absolute and above classes. As a matter of fact, democracy itself passes into an entirely new phase under the dictatorship of the proletariat, and the class struggle rises to a higher level, dominating over each and every form.

General talk about freedom, equality and democracy is in fact but a blind repetition of concepts shaped by the relations of commodity production. To attempt to solve the concrete problems of the dictatorship of the proletariat by such generalities is tantamount to accepting the theories and principles of the bourgeoisie in their entirety. From the point of view of the proletariat, the question can be put only in the following way: freedom from oppression by which class? equality of which class with which? democracy based on private property, or on a struggle for the abolition of private property?—and so forth.

Long ago Engels in his *Anti-Dühring* explained that the concept "equality" is moulded from the relations of commodity production; equality becomes a prejudice if it is not understood to mean the *abolition of classes*. This elementary truth regarding the distinction between the bourgeois-democratic and the socialist conception of equality is constantly being forgotten. But if it is not forgotten, it becomes obvious that by overthrowing the bourgeoisie the proletariat takes the most decisive step towards the abolition of classes, and that in order to complete the process the proletariat must continue its class struggle, making use of the apparatus of state power and employing various methods of combating, influencing and bringing pressure to bear on the overthrown bourgeoisie and the vacillating petty bourgeoisie.

V. I. Lenin

From: A GREAT BEGINNING

This brochure is about the heroism of Russian workers on the home front, about communist subbotniks. Lenin wrote it in 1919 to reveal the meaning and significance of the first communist subbotniks (labour freely given by the working people of the USSR on days off for the benefit of all society). The latter vividly showed the new attitude of workers towards labour at socialist enterprises belonging to the whole people.

The fact that Lenin brought to light the creative tasks of the state power of the working class, i.e., the tasks of the dictatorship of the proletariat, was of major significance for the economic theory of socialism. He emphasised that the dictatorship of the proletariat is not only coercion of the exploiters, and not even chiefly coercion. Its main constructive tasks are building a socialist system and, in the end, eliminating classes. Lenin pointed out the prerequisites and ways for complete extermination of classes through tremendous increase of the productive forces of socialist society; abolition of private ownership of the means of production; elimination of existing distinctions between town and countryside, between people of manual and mental labour; and creation of a new type of labour organisation compared with that existing under capitalism, a system that would rest on free and conscious discipline of the working people themselves.

Lenin's tenets on the role of labour productivity (workers' performance) for achieving the final victory of socialism over capitalism is of exceptionally important significance. The brochure specially underlines that capitalism could and would be finally defeated because socialism would develop a new and much higher productivity of labour. In this connection, Lenin assessed the role of communist subbotniks as the beginning of a struggle by the workers themselves for attaining the highest possible labour productivity, for augmenting the wealth of all society.

Today, too, the basic tenets of *A Great Beginning* retain their tremendous significance for socialist and communist construction in the USSR and other socialist states. The USSR and other socialist countries stage communist subbotniks; they also have widely developed socialist emulation, which is competition in labour of workers and enterprises, a competition essentially based on their comradely co-operation and mutual assistance and aimed at generally raising and improving social production.

The press reports many instances of the heroism of the Red Army men. In the fight against Kolchak, Denikin and other forces of the landowners and capitalists, the workers and peasants very often display miracles of bravery and endurance, defending the gains of the socialist revolution. The guerrilla spirit, weariness and indiscipline are being overcome; it is a slow and difficult process, but it is making headway in spite of everything. The heroism of the working people making voluntary sacrifices for the victory of socialism—this is the foundation of the new, comradely discipline in the Red Army, the foundation on which that army is regenerating, gaining strength and growing.

The heroism of the workers in the rear is no less worthy of attention. In this connection, the communist *subbotniks* organised by the workers on their own initiative are really of enormous significance. Evidently, this is only a beginning, but it is a beginning of exceptionally great importance. It is the beginning of a revolution that is more difficult, more tangible, more radical and more decisive than the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, for it is a victory over our own conservatism, indiscipline, petty-bourgeois egoism, a victory over the habits left as a heritage to the worker and peasant by accursed capitalism. Only when *this* victory is consolidated will the new social discipline, socialist discipline, be created; then and only then will a reversion to capitalism become impossible, will communism become really invincible...

As I have had occasion to point out more than once, among other occasions in the speech I delivered at a session of the Petrograd Soviet on March 12, the dictatorship of the proletariat is not only the use of force against the exploiters, and not even mainly the use of force. The economic foundation of this use of revolutionary force, the guarantee of its effectiveness and success is the fact that the proletariat represents and creates a higher type of social organisation of

labour compared with capitalism. This is what is important. this is the source of the strength and the guarantee that the final triumph of communism is inevitable.

The feudal organisation of social labour rested on the discipline of the bludgeon, while the working people, robbed and tyrannised by a handful of landowners, were utterly ignorant and downtrodden. The capitalist organisation of social labour rested on the discipline of hunger, and, notwithstanding all the progress of bourgeois culture and bourgeois democracy, the vast mass of the working people in the most advanced, civilised and democratic republics remained an ignorant and downtrodden mass of wage-slaves or oppressed peasants, robbed and tyrannised by a handful of capitalists. The communist organisation of social labour, the first step towards which is socialism, rests, and will do so more and more as time goes on, on the free and conscious discipline of the working people themselves who have thrown off the yoke both of the landowners and capitalists.

This new discipline does not drop from the skies, nor is it born from pious wishes; it grows out of the material conditions of large-scale capitalist production, and out of them alone. Without them it is impossible. And the repository, or the vehicle, of these material conditions is a definite historical class, created, organised, united, trained, educated and hardened by large-scale capitalism. This class is the proletariat.

If we translate the Latin, scientific, historico-philosophical term "dictatorship of the proletariat" into simpler language, it means just the following:

Only a definite class, namely, the urban workers and the factory, industrial workers in general, is able to lead the whole mass of the working and exploited people in the struggle to throw off the yoke of capital, in actually carrying it out, in the struggle to maintain and consolidate the victory, in the work of creating the new, socialist social system and in the entire struggle for the complete abolition of classes. (Let us observe in parenthesis that the only scientific distinction between socialism and communism is that the first term implies the first stage of the new society arising out of capitalism, while the second implies the next and higher stage.)

The mistake "Berne" yellow International makes is that its leaders accept the class struggle and the leading role of the proletariat only in word and are afraid to think it out to its logical conclusion. They are afraid of that inevitable conclusion which particularly terrifies the bourgeoisie, and which is absolutely unacceptable to them. They are afraid to admit that the dictatorship of the proletariat is *also* a period of class struggle, which is inevitable as long as classes have not been abolished, and which changes in form, being particularly fierce and particularly peculiar in the period immediately following the overthrow of capital. The proletariat does not cease the class struggle after it has captured political power, but continues it until classes are abolished—of course, under different circumstances, in different form and by different means.

And what does the "abolition of classes" mean? All those who call themselves socialists recognise this as the ultimate goal of socialism, but by no means all give thought to its significance. Classes are large groups of people differing from each other by the place they occupy in a historically determined system of social production, by their relation (in most cases fixed and formulated in law) to the means of production, by their role in the social organisation of labour, and, consequently, by the dimensions of the share of social wealth of which they dispose and the mode of acquiring it. Classes are groups of people one of which can appropriate the labour of another owing to the different places they occupy in a definite system of social economy.

Clearly, in order to abolish classes completely, it is not enough to overthrow the exploiters, the landowners and capitalists, not enough to abolish *their* rights of ownership; it is necessary also to abolish *all* private ownership of the means of production, it is necessary to abolish the distinction between town and country, as well as the distinction between manual workers and brain workers. This requires a very long period of time. In order to achieve this an enormous step forward must be taken in developing the productive forces; it is necessary to overcome the resistance (frequently passive, which is particularly stubborn and particularly difficult to overcome) of the numerous survivals of small-scale production; it is necessary to overcome the enormous force of habit

and conservatism which are connected with these survivals.

The assumption that all "working people" are equally capable of doing this work would be an empty phrase, or the illusion of an antediluvian, pre-Marxist socialist; for this ability does not come of itself, but grows historically, and grows *only* out of the material conditions of large-scale capitalist production. This ability, at the beginning of the road from capitalism to socialism, is possessed by the proletariat alone. It is capable of fulfilling the gigantic task that confronts it, first because it is the strongest and most advanced class in civilised societies; secondly, because in the most developed countries it constitutes the majority of the population, and thirdly, because in backward capitalist countries, like Russia, the majority of the population consists of semi-proletarians, i.e., of people who regularly live in a proletarian way part of the year, who regularly earn a part of their means of subsistence as wage-workers in capitalist enterprises.

Those who try to solve the problems involved in the transition from capitalism to socialism on the basis of general talk about liberty, equality, democracy in general, equality of labour democracy, etc. (as Kautsky, Martov and other heroes of the Berne yellow International do), thereby only reveal their petty-bourgeois, philistine nature and ideologically slavishly follow in the wake of the bourgeoisie. The correct solution of this problem can be found only in a concrete study of the specific relations between the specific class which has conquered political power, namely, the proletariat, and the whole non-proletarian, and also semi-proletarian, mass of the working population—relations which do not take shape in fantastically harmonious, "ideal" conditions, but in the real conditions of the frantic resistance of the bourgeoisie which assumes many and diverse forms.

The vast majority of the population—and all the more so of the working population—of any capitalist country, including Russia, have thousands of times experienced, themselves and through their kith and kin, the oppression of capital, the plunder and every sort of tyranny it perpetrates. The imperialist war, i.e., the slaughter of ten million people in order to decide whether British or German capital was to have supremacy in plundering the whole world, has greatly intensified these ordeals, has increased and deepened them,

and has made the people realise their meaning. Hence the inevitable sympathy displayed by the vast majority of the population, particularly the working people, for the proletariat, because it is with heroic courage and revolutionary ruthlessness throwing off the yoke of capital, overthrowing the exploiters, suppressing their resistance, and shedding its blood to pave the road for the creation of the new society, in which there will be no room for exploiters.

Great and inevitable as may be their petty-bourgeois vacillations and their tendency to go back to bourgeois "order", under the "wing" of the bourgeoisie, the non-proletarian and semi-proletarian mass of the working population cannot but recognise the moral and political authority of the proletariat, who are not only overthrowing the exploiters and suppressing their resistance, but are building a new and higher social bond, a social discipline, the discipline of class-conscious and united working people, who know no yoke and no authority except the authority of their own unity, of their own, more class-conscious, bold, solid, revolutionary and steadfast vanguard.

In order to achieve victory, in order to build and consolidate socialism, the proletariat must fulfil a twofold or dual task: first, it must, by its supreme heroism in the revolutionary struggle against capital win over the entire mass of the working and exploited people; it must win them over, organise them and lead them in the struggle to overthrow the bourgeoisie and utterly suppress their resistance. Secondly, it must lead the whole mass of the working and exploited people, as well as all the petty-bourgeois groups, on to the road of new economic development, 'owards the creation of a new social bond, a new labour discipline, a new organisation of labour, which will combine the last word in science and capitalist technology with the mass association of class-conscious workers creating large-scale socialist industry.

The second task is more difficult than the first, for it cannot possibly be fulfilled by single acts of heroic fervour; it requires the most prolonged, most persistent and most difficult mass heroism in *plain, everyday work*. But this task is more essential than the first, because, in the last analysis, the deepest source of strength for victories over the bourgeoisie and the sole guarantee of the durability and

permanence of these victories can only be a new and higher mode of social production, the substitution of large-scale socialist production for capitalist and petty-bourgeois production...

In the last analysis, productivity of labour is the most important, the principal thing for the victory of the new social system. Capitalism created a productivity of labour unknown under serfdom. Capitalism can be utterly vanquished, and will be utterly vanquished by socialism creating a new and much higher productivity of labour. This is a very difficult matter and must take a long time; but *it has been started*, and that is the main thing. If in starving Moscow, in the summer of 1919, the starving workers who had gone through four trying years of imperialist war and another year and half of still more trying civil war could start this great work, how will things develop later when we triumph in the civil war and win peace?

Communism is the higher productivity of labour—compared with that existing under capitalism—of voluntary, class-conscious and united workers employing advanced techniques. Communist subbotniks are extraordinarily valuable as the *actual* beginning of *communism*; and this is a very rare thing, because we are in a stage when “only the *first steps* in the transition from capitalism to communism are being taken” (as our Party Programme* quite rightly says).

Communism begins when the *rank-and-file workers* display an enthusiastic concern that is undaunted by arduous toil to increase the productivity of labour, husband *every pood of grain, coal, iron* and other products, which do not accrue to the workers personally or to their “close” kith and kin, but to their “distant” kith and kin, i.e., to society as a whole, to tens and hundreds of millions of people united first in one socialist state, and then in a union of Soviet republics.

V. I. Lenin

From: ON CO-OPERATION

This article was published in 1923 to become a significant contribution to the economic theory of Marxism on socialist restructuring of small-commodity peasant households. It outlines the ways for involving the working people (chiefly the peasants) in socialist construction via co-operative societies (a form of organisation of production based on group ownership by members of a co-operative). It also reveals the essence and role of these societies under a victorious socialist revolution and under the power of the working class in alliance with all the working people.

Cited below is the main part of Lenin's article, in which he criticises the viewpoint that a co-operative society is simply a commercial capitalist enterprise. Lenin showed that when the working class enjoys power and when it owns the principal means of production (including land), co-operative societies may be compatible with socialism. In this way, Lenin revealed in a new way the significance of these societies for building socialism. In co-operative societies he perceived a reliable form for combining the interests of small farmers with those of the whole of society, and revealed the ways for socialist co-operation of agriculture.

The experience of the USSR and other socialist countries has confirmed that the pathway indicated by Lenin for transition of the peasantry to socialism was correct.

I

It seems to me that not enough attention is being paid to the co-operative movement in our country. Not everyone understands that now, since the time of the October Revolution and quite apart from NEP (on the contrary, in this connection we must say—because of NEP), our co-operative movement has become one of great significance. There is a lot of fantasy in the dreams of the old co-operators. Often they are ridiculously fantastic. But why are they fantastic? Because people do not understand the fundamental, the rock-bottom significance of the working-class political struggle for the overthrow of the rule of the exploiters. We have overthrown the rule of the exploiters, and much that was fantastic, even romantic, even banal in the dreams of the old co-operators is now becoming unvarnished reality.

Indeed, since political power is in the hands of the working class, since this political power owns all the means of production, the only task, indeed, that remains for us is to organise the population in co-operative societies. With most of the population organised in co-operatives, the socialism which in the past was legitimately treated with ridicule, scorn and contempt by those who were rightly convinced that it was necessary to wage the class struggle, the struggle for political power, etc., will achieve its aim automatically. But not all comrades realise how vastly, how infinitely important it is now to organise the population of Russia in co-operative societies. By adopting NEP we made a concession to the peasant as a trader, to the principle of private trade; it is precisely for this reason (contrary to what some people think) that the co-operative movement is of such immense importance. All we actually need under NEP is to organise the population of Russia in co-operative societies on a sufficiently large scale, for we have now found that degree of combination of private interest, of private commercial interest, with state supervision and control of this interest, that degree of its

subordination to the common interests which was formerly the stumbling-block for very many socialists. Indeed, the power of the state over all large-scale means of production, political power in the hands of the proletariat, the alliance of this proletariat with the many millions of small and very small peasants, the assured proletarian leadership of the peasantry, etc.—is this not all that is necessary to build a complete socialist society out of co-operatives, out of co-operatives alone, which we formerly ridiculed as huckstering and which from a certain aspect we have the right to treat as such now, under NEP? Is this not all that is necessary to build a complete socialist society? It is still not the building of socialist society, but it is all that is necessary and sufficient for it.

It is this very circumstance that is underestimated by many of our practical workers. They look down upon our co-operative societies, failing to appreciate their exceptional importance, first, from the standpoint of principle (the means of production are owned by the state), and, second, from the standpoint of transition to the new system by means that are the *simplest, easiest and most acceptable to the peasant*.

But this again is of fundamental importance. It is one thing to draw up fantastic plans for building socialism through all sorts of workers' associations, and quite another to learn to build socialism in practice in such a way that *every* small peasant could take part in it. That is the very stage we have now reached. And there is no doubt that, having reached it, we are taking too little advantage of it.

We went too far when we introduced NEP, but not because we attached too much importance to the principle of free enterprise and trade—we went too far because we lost sight of the co-operatives, because we now underrate the co-operatives, because we are already beginning to forget the vast importance of the co-operatives from the above two points of view.

I now propose to discuss with the reader what can and must at once be done practically on the basis of this "co-operative" principle. By what means can we, and must we, start at once to develop this "co-operative" principle so that its socialist meaning may be clear to all?

Co-operation must be politically so organised that it will no

only generally and always enjoy certain privileges, but that these privileges should be of a purely material nature (a favourable bank-rate, etc.). The co-operatives must be granted state loans that are greater, if only by a little, than the loans we grant to private enterprises, even to heavy industry, etc.

A social system emerges only if it has the financial backing of a definite class. There is no need to mention the hundreds of millions of rubles that the birth of "free" capitalism cost. At present we have to realise that the co-operative system is the social system we must now give more than ordinary assistance, and we must actually give that assistance. But it must be assistance in the real sense of the word, i.e., it will not be enough to interpret it to mean assistance for any kind of co-operative trade; by assistance we must mean aid to co-operative trade in which *really large masses of the population actually take part*. It is certainly a correct form of assistance to give a bonus to peasants who take part in co-operative trade; but the whole point is to verify the nature of this participation, to verify the awareness behind it, and to verify its quality. Strictly speaking, when a co-operator goes to a village and opens a co-operative store, the people take no part in this whatever; but at the same time guided by their own interests they will hasten to try to take part in it.

There is another aspect to this question. From the point of view of the "enlightened" (primarily, literate) European there is not much left for us to do to induce absolutely everyone to take not a passive, but an active part in co-operative operations. Strictly speaking, there is "*only*" one thing we have left to do and that is to make our people so "enlightened" that they understand all the advantages of everybody participating in the work of the co-operatives, and organise this participation. "*Only*" that. There are now no other devices needed to advance to socialism. But to achieve this "*only*" there must be a veritable revolution—the entire people must go through a period of cultural development. Therefore, our rule must be: as little philosophising and as few acrobatics as possible. In this respect NEP is an advance, because it is adjustable to the level of the most ordinary peasant and does not demand anything higher of him. But it will take a whole historical epoch to get the entire population into the work of the co-operatives through NEP. At best we

can achieve this in one or two decades. Nevertheless, it will be a distinct historical epoch, and without this historical epoch, without universal literacy, without a proper degree of efficiency, without training the population sufficiently to acquire the habit of book-reading, and without the material basis for this, without a certain sufficiency to safeguard against, say, bad harvests, famine, etc.—without this we shall not achieve our object. The thing now is to learn to combine the wide revolutionary range of action, the revolutionary enthusiasm which we have displayed, and displayed abundantly, and crowned with complete success—to learn to combine this with (I am almost inclined to say) the ability to be an efficient and capable trader, which is quite enough to be a good co-operator. By ability to be a trader I mean the ability to be a cultured trader. Let those Russians, or peasants, who imagine that since they trade they are good traders, get that well into their heads. This does not follow at all. They do trade, but that is far from being cultured traders. They now trade in an Asiatic manner, but to be a good trader one must trade in the European manner. They are a whole epoch behind in that.

In conclusion: a number of economic, financial and banking privileges must be granted to the co-operatives—this is the way our socialist state must promote the new principle on which the population must be organised. But this is only the general outline of the task; it does not define and depict in detail the entire content of the practical task, i.e., we must find what form of "bonus" to give for joining the co-operatives (and the terms on which we should give it), the form of bonus by which we shall assist the co-operatives sufficiently, the form of bonus that will produce the civilised co-operator. And given social ownership of the means of production, given the class victory of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie, the system of civilised co-operators is the system of socialism.

**From: THE BASIC GUIDELINES
FOR ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT
OF THE USSR**

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union is the leading and guiding force of the Soviet people, the nucleus of its political system, of all Soviet state and public organisations. Armed with the Marxist-Leninist doctrine, the CPSU determines the general perspective of social development, the main line in Soviet foreign and home policy, guides the creative activities of the Soviet people, and imparts a systematic and science-based character to its struggle for the victory of communism.

At its congresses, convened once in five years, the CPSU considers draft state plans of the country's economic and social development for the next five-year period. These plans are then examined and approved by the Supreme Soviet of the USSR (the supreme body of state authority in the USSR).

The state plan represents a scientifically-grounded programme which determines the principal guidelines and the quantitative and qualitative indices of economic development. It ensures the co-ordinated activity of all the working people and the attainment of all projected goals with least expenditure of labour and material and financial resources. The fact that socialist economy develops under a single plan is a major advantage of socialism over capitalism. This is possible only when the means of production are publicly owned to ensure the economic and organisational unity of the economy. Development of all social production along planned lines permits the economy to advance continuously and at high rates; to correctly distribute productive forces over the country's territory; and to attain maximum economic results in the interests of all members of society.

The 26th CPSU Congress adopted the *Basic Guidelines for Economic and Social Development of the USSR*. This document determines the CPSU's long-term economic and social policies aimed at providing steadfast upsurge of the Soviet people's

material and cultural levels and at creating better conditions for all-round development of the individual. This policy underlies the 11th Five-Year Plan of Soviet economic development.

Cited below is an extract from the document adopted by the 26th CPSU Congress which brings to light the basic tasks of Soviet economic and social development for the said period.

productive and creative work, make considerable headway in eliminating the essential distinctions between mental and physical labour and in turning agrarian labour into a variety of industrial labour.

Pursue an effective demographic policy, promote consolidation of the family as the principal nucleus of socialist society and ensure the provision of better conditions for women to combine motherhood with active participation in labour and social activities; improve the maintenance of children and the disabled at the expense of society; implement a system of measures to increase people's life span and labour activity, and build up their health.

Broaden the possibilities for the harmonious intellectual life of people and for the access of the entire population to cultural values, ensure further advance of education and culture, improve moral education, and foster a communist attitude towards labour and to public property.

Use work time more rationally, reduce its non-productive expenditure and losses, increase the leisure time of the working people by developing the service sphere and facilitating domestic work, and improve the forms and organization of leisure time, particularly for young people.

Gradually obliterate the essential distinctions between town and countryside, and improve living conditions in all the republics and regions of the country.

Further the all-round development and drawing together of the nations and nationalities of the USSR, the growth of the social homogeneity of society, and the strengthening of the ideological and political unity of the Soviet people as a new historical entity.

Bring about society's further economic progress and profound qualitative advances in the material and technical basis by accelerating scientific and technical progress, intensifying social production, and raising its efficiency.

Promote the dynamic and balanced development of the economy of the USSR as a single economic complex, and the proportionate growth of all its branches, and of the economies of the Union republics. To increase by the national income used for consumption and accumulation by at least 40 per cent.

Raise the organization of social labour and of production to

a higher level; concentrate forces and resources on central economic tasks; ensure the elaboration and stage-by-stage implementation of target-oriented comprehensive programmes for major socio-economic problems, the food problem in the first place, for development of consumer goods production and services, for reduction of the use of manual labour, for the development of the engineering and power industries and all types of transport, wider use of chemicals in the national economy, and other large-scale programmes.

Carry out progressive changes in the structure of the national economy; improve inter-industry and intra-industry proportions; continue the priority development of industries decisive for scientific and technical progress and the establishment of large-scale territorial-industrial complexes; bring about the greatest possible development of the agroindustrial complex and accelerated growth of consumer goods production and of sectors of the production and social and welfare infrastructure.

Ensure effective use of natural, material and manpower resources as the decisive and most effective means of multiplying the national wealth of the country, and rapid growth of socialist accumulation and consumption resources, give special attention to raising labour productivity, increasing returns on fixed assets in all branches of the economy, and reducing the expenditure of materials in production.

Work for an organic fusion of the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution with the advantages of the socialist system of economy. Enhance the role of science in laying the material and technical basis of communism and in solving pressing social problems; consistently pursue a uniform technical policy, continue the electrification of the national economy, implement the switchover to large-scale application of highly effective systems of machines and technological processes ensuring comprehensive mechanization and automation of production and the technical retooling of its principal branches.

Increase the effectiveness of capital construction, carry out consistently its industrialization, qualitative improvement of the fixed assets and more rapid commissioning of new production facilities and their bringing up to the rated output; accelerate the reconstruction of existing enterprises.

Improve the distribution of the productive forces and the territorial division of labour; increase the contribution of every Union republic to the realization of countrywide tasks; ensure effective use in the national economy of the fuel, energy, mineral and other raw material resources of the eastern and northern regions; pursue consistently the policy of limiting the growth of large cities and develop small and medium-size towns, locating in them specialized, highly efficient production capacities, and branches of enterprises and amalgamations. Work out a master scheme for the long-term distribution of the productive forces of the USSR.

Extend and improve economic, scientific, technical, cultural and tourist ties with other countries and primarily with the countries of the socialist community.

Raise the level of guidance of the economy, combine more fully centralized management with the economic autonomy and initiative of enterprises and amalgamations; introduce everywhere the most advanced methods of socialist management, consistently implement the immutable principle of economic development: attaining the best results for the benefit of society with the least expenditure. Enhance the role of the Soviets of People's Deputies, the trade unions and work collectives in deciding these questions.

The *eleventh five-year plan* will be a crucial stage in the realization of long-term programmes. It is to embody the continuity of the policy of the country's socio-economic development and the Party's strategic guidelines for the taking into account the specific features of the next five years.

The central objective of the eleventh five-year plan is to ensure the further growth of the well-being of the Soviet people through the stable and consistent development of the economy, acceleration of scientific and technical progress and of the changeover of the economy to intensive development, more rational use of the country's productive potential, the utmost economy of all types of resources, and improvement of the quality of work.

Proceeding from the economic strategy of the CPSU and the central objective of the eleventh five-year plan, to:

1. *Carry out a system of measures for the consistent improvement of the well-being of the people. Give prime*

attention to improving the supply to the population of consumer goods, housing conditions, medical services and working conditions, and to solving other urgent social tasks. Relate the improvement of the conditions of life of the people more closely to the attainment of production objectives.

Increase the effectiveness of the system of material and moral incentives and the stimulating role of remuneration in accordance with the work done—the main source of the people's incomes. Ensure the priority growth of labour productivity as compared with the growth of remuneration in the different branches of the economy, in production amalgamations and individual enterprises.

Increase the social consumption funds, promote the further development of the social maintenance system, education and culture, and improve living conditions of families with children and facilities for recreation and leisure.

Take care to improve the working and living conditions of the working people, to ensure a creative atmosphere and a healthy socio-psychological climate in every working collective, to facilitate improvement of professional skills, to meet cultural requirements, and to promote physical culture and sports in amalgamations, at enterprises, institutions and organizations.

Facilitate in every way the growth of the social and labour activity of Soviet people and the development of socialist emulation.

2. Ensure steady growth of the economy, improve the structure of social production.

Increase the national income used for consumption and accumulation by 18-20 per cent.

Develop at a priority rate the industries ensuring progressive structural shifts in the national economy and stable and balanced extended reproduction. Continue the technical re-tooling of the basic industries—power, metallurgical, machine-building, chemical, as well as transport and construction. Improve the structure of the fuel-energy complex and of the production of structural materials through increasing the output of the most progressive products. Work for greater coordination in the development of the extractive and manufacturing industries and of the branches which produce and consume instruments of labour, taking full account of the

extension of socialist international cooperation and deepening of the specialization of production.

Ensure higher production growth rates in the "B" group industries than in the "A" group.

Provide for the greatest possible development of the agro-industrial and the food complex, for the proportionate, balanced growth of agriculture, the branches of industry servicing it, the food industry, and the industries connected with the procurement, storage, transportation and processing of agricultural products. In agriculture lay stress on the tasks of increasing the production of grain and fodder, developing animal husbandry, ensuring the preservation of agricultural products, and delivering them in the best commercial form to the consumer. Accelerate the transition of agriculture to an industrial basis and progressive technology.

Implement measures for improving the operation of all types of transport and, above all, railway transport, and ensure their development in full conformity with the requirements of the economy and the population.

Consolidate and improve the countrywide system of material and technical supply, enhance its role and responsibility for the rational and economical use of material resources and for the uninterrupted supply of the economy with raw and other materials, equipment and spare parts.

Concentrate capital investments in the main directions and the major projects due for completion, and above all, in the reconstruction and retooling of operating enterprises. Build quickly, economically and at a high technical level.

Build new enterprises primarily in those branches and industries that ensure progressive changes in the structure of the economy and the utilization in the economy of the fuel, energy, mineral and other raw material resources of the eastern and northern regions of the country. Limit the construction of new production facilities in the European part of the country.

Strengthen the material and technical base of capital construction, better provide it with skilled personnel, ensure conformity between the capacities of subcontracting organizations and the volume of the work they do.

Ensure the comprehensive development of the economies of the Union republics and economic areas, and improve their

specialization in the system of the social division of labour.

3. *Enhance persistently the effectiveness of social production through its all-round intensification and improve the quality of goods and services in all branches.*

Ensure the most rational use of material, manpower and financial resources which is indispensable for balanced economic development, for creating the necessary reserves and achieving high end results.

Raise the productivity of social labour by 17-20 per cent and obtain through this at least 85-90 per cent of the increment in the national income.

Increase the availability of machinery per worker; introduce in every way comprehensive mechanization and automation of production processes, reduce steadily the number of manual workers in all industries, especially in ancillary and supporting operations. Take measures to achieve a balance between the existing and newly-created jobs and the manpower resources. Create conditions for providing new enterprises, especially in Siberia and the Far East, with personnel. Improve the organization of work, the system of rate setting, and incentives. Introduce scientific organization of work and raise its effectiveness.

Improve considerably the quality of all types of output, broaden and renovate the range of products in keeping with the present-day requirements of economic development and of scientific and technical progress, as well as with the growing requirements of the population. Increase steadily the share of top-quality products in overall production. Introduce actively integrated systems of quality control.

Implement measures to increase the returns from fixed assets in the branches of the national economy, in enterprises and their amalgamations.

Use production facilities more rationally, introduce highly productive machinery on a larger scale, and improve the structure and timely renovation of the operating fixed assets.

Pay special attention to reducing the time it takes to bring the production facilities of new enterprises and projects up to design output level and attaining other high technical and economic performance indicators, increasing the shift index of the most efficient machines and mechanisms, and accelerating the replacement of obsolete equipment.

increased production of machines and units of large unit capacity and productivity, of highly economic equipment, and of complete systems of machines for comprehensive mechanization and automation of production.

Improve standards and specifications for finished products, components, packing cases and raw and other materials and services, in accordance with consumer requirements.

Raise the effectiveness of scientific research, reduce considerably the time it takes to introduce scientific and technological achievements in production. Improve coordination among scientific institutions, ensure priority development of fundamental research and increase the effectiveness of applied research. Strengthen the material base of research, design and prospecting organizations and higher educational institutions.

5. *Enhance the protection of nature, the land and its mineral wealth, the atmosphere, water bodies and the flora and fauna. Ensure rational use and reproduction of natural resources.*

6. *Improve administration and raise management standards in all spheres of the economy, accentuate orientation on the attainment of optimal final economic results.*

Enhance the organization and coordination of work in all the branches of the national economy. Consistently improve planning, ensure organic interaction of the plan, the economic levers and incentives, perfect organizational structures and methods of management.

Promote in every way initiative, a businesslike approach and a creative search for reserves for increasing production, ensure a high degree of organization and executive discipline in every sector of production.

Increase the responsibility of executives for the results and quality of work, achievement of planned targets and contractual obligations, observance of the principles of cost accounting, ensuring the profitability of production, expanding the wage fund, and for the accelerated turnover of current assets. Wage a resolute struggle against any manifestation of departmentalism and parochialism and against the understating of plans; and prevent unfounded revision of plan targets. Enhance the role and initiative of work collectives in management and planning, in instilling in workers the spirit of

a conscientious, creative attitude to work and of a high degree of social and production activity.

7. *Raise the effectiveness of foreign economic relations.* Ensure the deepening of socialist economic integration with the CMEA countries. Broaden cooperation with developing countries, and mutually advantageous trade with capitalist states.

Section III

WHAT ARE SOCIALISM AND COMMUNISM?

Initially, socialist doctrines were critically utopian. In the early 19th century, utopian socialists Saint-Simon and Fourier in France and Owen in England exposed the vices of capitalist society, in which they noted the prevalence of anarchy (disorder, lack of organisation) in production which manifests itself in the constant contradiction between the interests of private proprietors and those of society; in the prosperity of parasitic social classes at the expense of other people's labour; and in the false verbiage about "human rights" without guaranteeing the right to work.

Utopian socialists dreamed of the most justful social system, viz. socialism and communism, under which they assumed all people would really be free and socially equal, and society would create an abundance of material wealth to satisfy human requirements and ensure the flourishing of the individual. However, Saint-Simon, Fourier and Owen were unaware of the objective laws and motive forces of social development and could not indicate a real way out of capitalist wage bondage.

Marx and Engels were the first to transform socialism from a dream into a true science, a science of the general laws, ways and forms of the struggle of the proletariat, of the socialist revolution, and of socialist and communist construction. The arisal of scientific communism in the 1840s was theoretically based on two scientific discoveries by Marx and Engels, namely materialist understanding of history and the theory of surplus value. Historical materialism revealed the objective foundations underlying the existence of human society and the general tendencies in its onward development. The Marxist theory of surplus value showed the essence of wage bondage under capitalism and exposed the economic basis of the contradictions in bourgeois society and proved the natural inevitability of a socialist revolution.

In elaborating scientific communism, Marx and Engels

proved that only a socialist revolution could resolve the irreconcilable contradictions of capitalism. That revolution would eliminate the dominance of the bourgeoisie to establish the power of the working class. The proletariat with its allies from other sections of the working people would be the social force designed to eliminate capitalism and establish a socialist system. Marx and Engels did a great service to mankind by substantiating the need for the proletariat to create its own political party, namely the Communist Party, which is the vanguard of the working class and the leader of the working people's struggle for socialism and communism.

Marx and Engels generalised the experience of the 1871 Paris Commune, the world's first proletarian revolution and the first working class's government. They also substantiated their doctrine on the dictatorship of the proletariat, the working class's state power that comes to be established in the course of a socialist revolution. They developed the tenet that a revolutionary transitional period from capitalism to socialism was inevitable. They also advanced a scientifically-grounded idea of the communist social and economic structure, which involves the socialist and communist stages of development, and determined their characteristic features.

A new stage in the development of the theory of scientific communism is connected with Lenin, who creatively enriched the theory of socialist revolution and socialist and communist construction. In fact, Lenin armed the Russian and international revolutionary movements with a scientifically-grounded strategy and tactics and headed the struggle for implementing the ideas of scientific communism.

The Leninist stage in the development of scientific communism is being furthered by the theoretical work of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and other communist and workers' parties.

The victorious Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia and subsequent socialist revolutions in some other countries turned socialism into a world social system. These were major historical events in the development and implementation of the theory of scientific communism. With the arisal of practically existing socialism, scientific communism became a verified science on how to build a new socialist society.

The CPSU and other communist and workers' parties have

enriched scientific communism with new conclusions and tenets, which provide answers to the most vital issues of our time. They serve as reliable reference points for the revolutionary working-class and national liberation movements, for socialist and communist construction, and for the struggle for universal peace and security.

Thus, the Marxist-Leninist characteristic of the present-day epoch as one of mankind's transition from capitalism to socialism, and also its characteristic of the basic contradiction of this epoch, namely between socialism and imperialism on an international scale, is highly significant for understanding present-day reality. In recent years, this contradiction has become even more acute: the struggle between socialism and imperialism has intensified in the military, economic, political and ideological spheres. The CPSU and other communist and workers' parties forewarn that attempts to resolve the historical dispute between the two world systems through a military conflict would be disastrous to humanity. Communists have always struggled to preserve civilisation, to ensure the right to life.

Over the past two decades, the theory of scientific communism has come to be enriched with new ideas about existing socialism. A new concept of developed socialism has been advanced and substantiated, and this has allowed to correctly assess the achievements and prospects of social progress. For instance, the transition from capitalism to socialism has been completed and socialism built in the European socialist countries, the latter are building developed socialism. The USSR has already built developed socialism and is now continuing systematic and all-round work for perfecting it. Practice has proven that developed socialism represents sufficiently high maturity of productive forces and social and economic relations, under which the advantages of the new social system are revealed ever more amply. It is a lengthy stage in the onward march of society towards communism.

The theory of scientific communism expanded and deepened the existing ideas on the new type of relations existing between socialist countries. The socialist system provides all opportunities for assured progress and harmonious relationships between them. At the same time, latest

developments require not simply to expand co-operation among fraternal socialist countries, but to improve its quality and efficacy. This assumes further perfection of political interaction between socialist states; a transition to a qualitatively new level of economic integration (increasingly deeper, all-round and effective joint activity of their national economies with simultaneous consolidation of the latter); further drawing closer together of the ideologies of fraternal peoples, and strengthening of their feeling of unity and of the commonness of their historical destinies; and greater exchange of cultural values. Such are the long-term prospects for development of new relations among socialist countries.

The theory of scientific communism reflects a fundamental feature in the present-day world, namely, the growing role of Asian, African, and Latin American countries that have freed themselves from colonial and semi-colonial dependence. This is marked by complex and ambivalent processes.

Some of these countries follow the road of capitalist development. However, their objective interests run counter to the aggressive policy of domination and diktat pursued by imperialist powers. In seeking ways to overcome their economic backwardness, developing countries need equitable international co-operation and stable peace. Many of them see their ties with socialist countries as a means for strengthening their independence. On their part, the socialist states, too, intend to continue their mutual co-operation with those countries with full respect for their sovereignty and non-interference in their internal affairs.

Many developing countries have taken a course oriented at building socialism. They have the same ideals of social justice and progress as the socialist states, and also the same anti-imperialist, peaceful objectives in foreign policy. At the same time, however, their position reveals certain difficulties in their revolutionary development. To build socialism, the country in question must have a sufficiently high level of productive forces, culture, and social consciousness. The socialist countries assist these progressive states in politics and culture, and help them consolidate their defences and economic development. Yet, their overall social progress may only result from the work of their peoples and from correct policies of their leadership.

Finally, the theory of scientific communism reflects new processes in the capitalist world, whose general crisis has considerably aggravated. The methods by which capitalism could previously maintain relatively stable development in the post-World War II period are becoming increasingly ineffective. Imperialism has proven incapable of coping with the unprecedentedly deep and large-scale social consequences of the scientific and technological revolution, when millions of working people are doomed to unemployment and poverty.

Guided by the practically verified theory of scientific communism, the CPSU and other communist and workers' parties come out as the most consistent defenders of sound principles in international relations, as defenders of the interests of detente and peace and of the interests of every people and all mankind.

This section includes works by Marx, Engels and Lenin which expound the fundamentals of the theory of scientific communism. It also includes various documents published by the Soviet state, the CPSU, and the international communist and working-class movement. These documents show how the theory of scientific communism is being further developed in present-day conditions.

Karl Marx and Frederick Engels

From: MANIFESTO OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

In 1848, Marx and Engels wrote the *Communist Manifesto* on the instructions of the Second Congress of the Communist League, the first international organisation of the revolutionary proletariat. This work was the first programme document outlining the objectives and tasks of communist transformation of society. Its four chapters set forth the basic ideas of scientific communism. Published below are Chapters I and II and the main part of Chapter IV.

Chapter I (*Bourgeois and Proletarians*) substantiates the inevitable replacement of capitalist society by communist society. Here, Marx and Engels for the first time expounded their doctrine on classes and class struggle. Having theoretically summarised the history of mankind's development, they established that with the exception of the primitive system the entire history of human society was the history of a struggle between classes, which are social groups whose interests in exploiter societies are incompatible and contradictory. Under the slave-owning system, the class struggle was between the slave-owners and slaves; under feudalism, between the feudal lords and peasants dependent on them; and in bourgeois society, between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. Marx and Engels showed that the outcome of this struggle was predetermined: not only had the bourgeoisie forged the weapon that would bring about its own death, i.e., the modern productive forces of big machine production, but had engendered the people who would direct that weapon against it, namely modern workers. The working class is called upon by history to take hold of what has been created by its labour; to socialise the means of production (the material prerequisites of labour) in the course of a socialist revolution; and to manage present-day economy and the whole of society.

Chapter II (*Proletarians and Communists*) is devoted to communist transformation of society. It rejects the ridiculous

accusations against Communists that they allegedly want to destroy people's property, nationality, homeland, religion, and morals. Marx and Engels showed that it is capitalism that deprives the majority of people of all this. They voiced a scientifically-grounded prevision that, under socialism, as a result of changed living conditions, the views, consciousness and social relations of people would also inevitably change.

Marx and Engels answered the important question what tasks the state of the working class is called upon to resolve. The first one is to take away from the bourgeoisie all the means of production and to concentrate them in the hands of the proletarian state so as to turn them into social property. The second one is to rapidly develop the production of material wealth in order to create conditions for providing complete welfare for all members of society. Marx and Engels determined the essence of the new communist system as an association of people in which "the free development of each is the precondition for the free development of all".

Chapter III (*Socialist and Communist Literature*) critically analyses various pre-scientific socialist and communist doctrines, including utopian socialist theories.

Chapter IV (*Position of the Communists in Relation to the Various Existing Opposition Parties*) explains the communist attitude towards other social movements. Marx and Engels substantiated the important tenet that Communists support everywhere any revolutionary movement directed against the bourgeois system. They strive to combine all the social forces that come out for establishing the sovereignty of the people (democracy). In this case, they invariably and consistently strive to attain the ultimate goal of any revolutionary movement, namely, communism. This requires the unity and consolidation of the working class, of all the working people, and of the oppressed nations of all countries.

The *Communist Manifesto* opened the way to a new era in history and ushered in the great revolutionary movement for socialist transformation of the world. This is how Lenin assessed the first communist programme document: "This little booklet is worth whole volumes: to this day its spirit inspires and guides the entire organised and fighting proletariat of the civilised world" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 2, Progress Publishers, Moscow, p. 24).

A spectre is haunting Europe—the spectre of Communism. All the Powers of old Europe have entered into a holy alliance to exorcise this spectre: Pope and Czar, Metternich and Guizot, French Radicals and German police-spies.

Where is the party in opposition that has not been decried as Communistic by its opponents in power? Where the Opposition that has not hurled back the branding reproach of Communism, against the more advanced opposition parties, as well as against its reactionary adversaries?

Two things result from this fact:

I. Communism is already acknowledged by all European Powers to be itself a Power.

II. It is high time that Communists should openly, in the face of the whole world, publish their views, their aims, their tendencies, and meet this nursery tale of the Spectre of Communism with a Manifesto of the party itself.

To this end, Communists of various nationalities have assembled in London, and sketched the following Manifesto, to be published in the English, French, German, Italian, Flemish and Danish languages.

I

BOURGEOIS AND PROLETARIANS*

The history of all hitherto existing society ** is the history of class struggles.

Freeman and slave, patrician and plebeian, lord and serf, guild-master *** and journeyman, in a word, oppressor and oppressed, stood in constant opposition to one another, carried on an uninterrupted, now hidden, now open fight, a fight that each time ended, either in a revolutionary reconstitution of society at large, or in the common ruin of the contending classes.

In the earlier epochs of history, we find almost everywhere a complicated arrangement of society into various orders, a manifold gradation of social rank. In ancient Rome we have patricians, knights, plebeians, slaves; in the Middle Ages, feudal lords, vassals, guild-masters, journeymen, apprentices, serfs; in almost all of these classes, again, subordinate gradations.

* By bourgeoisie is meant the class of modern Capitalists, owners of the means of social production and employers of wage-labour. By proletariat the class of modern wage-labourers who, having no means of production of their own, are reduced to selling their labour-power in order to live.

** That is, all written history. In 1847, the pre-history of society, the social organisation existing previous to recorded history, was all but unknown. Since then, Haxthausen discovered common ownership of land in Russia. Maurer proved it to be the social foundation from which all Teutonic races started in history, and by and by village communities were found to be, or to have been primitive form of society everywhere from India to Ireland. The inner organisation of this primitive Communistic society was laid bare, in its typical form, by Morgan's crowning discovery of the true nature of the gens and its relation to the tribe. With the dissolution of these primeval communities society begins to be differentiated into separate and finally antagonistic classes. I have attempted to retrace this process of dissolution in *Der Ursprung der Familie, des Privateigenthums und des Staats*, 2nd edition, Stuttgart, 1886. (Note by Engels to the English edition of 1888, and—less the last sentence—to the German edition of 1890.)

*** Guild-master, that is, a full member of a guild, a master within, not a head of a guild. (Note by Engels to the English edition of 1888.)

The modern bourgeois society that has sprouted from the ruins of feudal society has not done away with class antagonisms. It has but established new classes, new conditions of oppression, new forms of struggle in place of the old ones.

Our epoch, the epoch of the bourgeoisie, possesses, however, this distinctive feature: it has simplified the class antagonisms. Society as a whole is more and more splitting up into two great hostile camps, into two great classes directly facing each other: Bourgeoisie and Proletariat.

From the serfs of the Middle Ages sprang the chartered burghers of the earliest towns. From these bourgesses the first elements of the bourgeoisie were developed.

The discovery of America, the rounding of the Cape, opened up fresh ground for the rising bourgeoisie. The East-Indian and Chinese markets, the colonisation of America, trade with the colonies, the increase in the means of exchange and in commodities generally, gave to commerce, to navigation, to industry, an impulse never before known, and thereby, to the revolutionary element in the tottering feudal society, a rapid development.

The feudal system of industry, under which industrial production was monopolised by closed guilds, now no longer sufficed for the growing wants of the new markets. The manufacturing system took its place. The guild-masters were pushed on one side by the manufacturing middle class; division of labour between the different corporate guilds vanished in the face of division of labour in each single workshop.

Meantime the markets kept ever growing, the demand ever rising. Even manufacture no longer sufficed. Thereupon, steam and machinery revolutionised industrial production. The place of manufacture was taken by the giant, Modern Industry, the place of the industrial middle class, by industrial millionaires, the leaders of whole industrial armies, the modern bourgeois.

Modern industry has established the world market, for which the discovery of America paved the way. This market has given an immense development to commerce, to navigation, to communication by land. This development has, in its turn, reacted on the extension of industry; and in proportion as

industry, commerce, navigation, railways extended, in the same proportion the bourgeoisie developed, increased its capital, and pushed into the background every class handed down from the Middle Ages.

We see, therefore, how the modern bourgeoisie is itself the product of a long course of development, of a series of revolutions in the modes of production and of exchange.

Each step in the development of the bourgeoisie was accompanied by a corresponding political advance of that class. An oppressed class under the sway of the feudal nobility, an armed and self-governing association in the medieval commune*; here independent urban republic (as in Italy and Germany), there taxable "third estate" of the monarchy (as in France), afterwards, in the period of manufacture proper, serving either the semi-feudal or the absolute monarchy as a counterpoise against the nobility, and, in fact, cornerstone of the great monarchies in general, the bourgeoisie has at last, since the establishment of Modern Industry and of the world market, conquered for itself in the modern representative State, exclusive political sway. The executive of the modern State is but a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie.

The bourgeoisie, historically, has played a most revolutionary part.

The bourgeoisie, wherever it has got the upper hand, has put an end to all feudal, patriarchal, idyllic relations. It has pitilessly torn asunder the motley feudal ties that bound man to his "natural superiors", and has left remaining no other nexus between man and man than naked self-interest, than callous "cash payment". It has drowned the most heavenly ecstasies of religious fervour, of chivalrous enthusiasm, of philistine sentimentalism, in the icy water of egotistical

* "Commune" was the name taken, in France, by the nascent towns even before they had conquered from their feudal lords and masters local self-government and political rights as the "Third Estate". Generally speaking, for the economical development of the bourgeoisie, England is here taken as the typical country; for its political development, France. (*Note by Engels to the English edition of 1888.*)

This was the name given their urban communities by the townsmen of Italy and France, after they had purchased or wrested their initial rights of self-government from their feudal lords. (*Note by Engels to the German edition of 1890.*)

calculation. It has resolved personal worth into exchange value, and in place of the numberless indefeasible chartered freedoms, has set up that single, unconscionable freedom—Free Trade. In one word, for exploitation, veiled by religious and political illusions, it has substituted naked, shameless, direct, brutal exploitation.

The bourgeoisie has stripped of its halo every occupation hitherto honoured and looked up to with reverent awe. It has converted the physician, the lawyer, the priest, the poet, the man of science, into its paid wage-labourers.

The bourgeoisie has torn away from the family its sentimental veil, and has reduced the family relation to a mere money relation.

The bourgeoisie has disclosed how it came to pass that the brutal display of vigour in the Middle Ages, which Reactionists so much admire, found its fitting complement in the most slothful indolence. It has been the first to show what man's activity can bring about. It has accomplished wonders far surpassing Egyptian pyramids, Roman aqueducts, and Gothic cathedrals; it has conducted expeditions that put in the shade all former Exodus of nations and crusades.

The bourgeoisie cannot exist without constantly revolutionising the instruments of production, and thereby the relations of production, and with them the whole relations of society. Conservation of the old modes of production in unaltered form, was, on the contrary, the first condition of existence for all earlier industrial classes. Constant revolutionising of production, uninterrupted disturbance of all social conditions, everlasting uncertainty and agitation distinguish the bourgeois epoch from all earlier ones. All fixed, fast-frozen relations, with their train of ancient and venerable prejudices and opinions, are swept away, all new-formed ones become antiquated before they can ossify. All that is solid melts into air, all that is holy is profaned, and man is at last compelled to face with sober senses, his real conditions of life, and his relations with his kind.

The need of a constantly expanding market for its products chases the bourgeoisie over the whole surface of the globe. It must nestle everywhere, settle everywhere, establish connexions everywhere.

The bourgeoisie has through its exploitation of the world

market given a cosmopolitan character to production and consumption in every country. To the great chagrin of Reactionists, it has drawn from under the feet of industry the national ground on which it stood. All old-established national industries have been destroyed or are daily being destroyed. They are dislodged by new industries, whose introduction becomes a life and death question for all civilised nations, by industries that no longer work up indigenous raw material, but raw material drawn from the remotest zones; industries whose products are consumed, not only at home, but in every quarter of the globe. In place of the old wants, satisfied by the productions of the country, we find new wants, requiring for their satisfaction the products of distant lands and climes. In place of the old local and national seclusion and self-sufficiency, we have intercourse in every direction, universal inter-dependence of nations. And as in material, so also in intellectual production. The intellectual creations of individual nations become common property. National one-sidedness and narrow-mindedness become more and more impossible, and from the numerous national and local literatures, there arises a world literature.

The bourgeoisie, by the rapid improvement of all instruments of production, by the immensely facilitated means of communication, draws all, even the most barbarian, nations into civilisation. The cheap prices of its commodities are the heavy artillery with which it batters down all Chinese walls, with which it forces the barbarians' intensely obstinate hatred of foreigners to capitulate. It compels all nations, on pain of extinction, to adopt the bourgeois mode of production; it compels them to introduce what it calls civilisation into their midst, i.e., to become bourgeois themselves. In one word, it creates a world after its own image.

The bourgeoisie has subjected the country to the rule of the towns. It has created enormous cities, has greatly increased the urban population as compared with the rural, and has thus rescued a considerable part of the population from the idiocy of rural life. Just as it has made the country dependent on the towns, so it has made barbarian and semi-barbarian countries dependent on the civilised ones, nations of peasants on nations of bourgeois, the East on the West.

The bourgeoisie keeps more and more doing away with the

scattered state of the population, of the means of production, and of property. It has agglomerated population, centralised means of production, and has concentrated property in a few hands. The necessary consequence of this was political centralisation. Independent, or but loosely connected provinces with separate interests, laws, governments and systems of taxation, became lumped together into one nation, with one government, one code of laws, one national class-interest, one frontier and one customs-tariff.

The bourgeoisie, during its rule of scarce one hundred years, has created more massive and more colossal productive forces than have all preceding generations together. Subjection of Nature's forces to man, machinery, application of chemistry to industry and agriculture, steam-navigation, railways, electric telegraphs, clearing of whole continents for cultivation, canalisation of rivers, whole populations conjured out of the ground—what earlier century had even a presentiment that such productive forces slumbered in the lap of social labour?

We see then: the means of production and of exchange, on whose foundation the bourgeoisie built itself up, were generated in feudal society. At a certain stage in the development of these means of production and of exchange, the conditions under which feudal society produced and exchanged, the feudal organisation of agriculture and manufacturing industry, in one word, the feudal relations of property became no longer compatible with the already developed productive forces; they became so many fetters. They had to be burst asunder; they were burst asunder.

Into their place stepped free competition, accompanied by a social and political constitution adapted to it, and by the economical and political sway of the bourgeois class.

A similar movement is going on before our own eyes. Modern bourgeois society with its relations of production, of exchange and of property, a society that has conjured up such gigantic means of production and of exchange, is like the sorcerer, who is no longer able to control the powers of the nether world whom he has called up by his spells. For many a decade past the history of industry and commerce is but the history of the revolt of modern productive forces against modern conditions of production, against the property rela-

tions that are the conditions for the existence of the bourgeoisie and of its rule. It is enough to mention the commercial crises that by their periodical return put on its trial, each time more threateningly, the existence of the entire bourgeois society. In these crises a great part not only of the existing products, but also of the previously created productive forces, are periodically destroyed. In these crises there breaks out an epidemic that, in all earlier epochs, would have seemed an absurdity—the epidemic of over-production. Society suddenly finds itself put back into a state of momentary barbarism; it appears as if a famine, a universal war of devastation had cut off the supply of every means of subsistence; industry and commerce seem to be destroyed; and why? Because there is too much civilisation, too much means of subsistence, too much industry, too much commerce. The productive forces at the disposal of society no longer tend to further the development of the conditions of bourgeois property; on the contrary, they have become too powerful for these conditions, by which they are fettered, and so soon as they overcome these fetters, they bring disorder into the whole of bourgeois society, endanger the existence of bourgeois property. The conditions of bourgeois society are too narrow to comprise the wealth created by them. And how does the bourgeoisie get over these crises? On the one hand by enforced destruction of a mass of productive forces; on the other, by the conquest of new markets, and by the more thorough exploitation of the old ones. That is to say, by paving the way for more extensive and more destructive crises, and by diminishing the means whereby crises are prevented.

The weapons with which the bourgeoisie felled feudalism to the ground are now turned against the bourgeoisie itself.

But not only has the bourgeoisie forged the weapons that bring death to itself; it has also called into existence the men who are to wield those weapons—the modern working class—the proletarians.

In proportion as the bourgeoisie, i.e., capital, is developed, in the same proportion is the proletariat, the modern working class, developed—a class of labourers, who live only so long as they find work, and who find work only so long as their labour increases capital. These labourers, who must sell

themselves piecemeal, are a commodity, like every other article of commerce, and are consequently exposed to all the vicissitudes of competition, to all the fluctuations of the market.

Owing to the extensive use of machinery and to division of labour, the work of the proletarians has lost all individual character, and, consequently, all charm for the workman. He becomes an appendage of the machine, and it is only the most simple, most monotonous, and most easily acquired knack, that is required of him. Hence, the cost of production of a workman is restricted, almost entirely, to the means of subsistence that he requires for his maintenance, and for the propagation of his race. But the price of a commodity, and therefore also of labour,* is equal to its cost of production. In proportion, therefore, as the repulsiveness of the work increases, the wage decreases. Nay more, in proportion as the use of machinery and division of labour increases, in the same proportion the burden of toil also increases, whether by prolongation of the working hours, by increase of the work exacted in a given time or by increased speed of the machinery, etc.

Modern industry has converted the little workshop of the patriarchal master into the great factory of the industrial capitalist. Masses of labourers, crowded into the factory, are organised like soldiers. As privates of the industrial army they are placed under the command of a perfect hierarchy of officers and sergeants. Not only are they slaves of the bourgeois class, and of the bourgeois State; they are daily and hourly enslaved by the machine, by the overseer, and, above all, by the individual bourgeois manufacturer himself. The more openly this despotism proclaims gain to be its end and aim, the more petty, the more hateful and the more embittering it is.

The less the skill and exertion of strength implied in manual labour, in other words, the more modern industry becomes developed, the more is the labour of men superseded by that of women. Differences of age and sex have no longer any distinctive social validity for the working class. All are

* Later Marx proved that the worker sells to the capitalist not his labour but his labour power.—*Ed.*

instruments of labour, more or less expensive to use, according to their age and sex.

No sooner is the exploitation of the labourer by the manufacturer, so far, at an end, and he receives his wages in cash, than he is set upon by the other portions of the bourgeoisie, the landlord, the shopkeeper, the pawnbroker, etc.

The lower strata of the middle class—the small tradespeople, shopkeepers, and retired tradesmen generally, the handicraftsmen and peasants—all these sink gradually into the proletariat, partly because their diminutive capital does not suffice for the scale on which Modern Industry is carried on, and is swamped in the competition with the large capitalists, partly because their specialised skill is rendered worthless by new methods of production. Thus the proletariat is recruited from all classes of the population.

The proletariat goes through various stages of development. With its birth begins its struggle with the bourgeoisie. At first the contest is carried on by individual labourers, then by the workpeople of a factory, then by the operatives of one trade, in one locality, against the individual bourgeois who directly exploits them. They direct their attacks not against the bourgeois conditions of production, but against the instruments of production themselves; they destroy imported wares that compete with their labour, they smash to pieces machinery, they set factories ablaze, they seek to restore by force the vanished status of the workman of the Middle Ages.

At this stage the labourers still form an incoherent mass scattered over the whole country, and broken up by their mutual competition. If anywhere they unite to form more compact bodies, this is not yet the consequence of their own active union, but of the union of the bourgeoisie, which class, in order to attain its own political ends, is compelled to set the whole proletariat in motion, and is moreover yet, for a time, able to do so. At this stage, therefore, the proletarians do not fight their enemies, but the enemies of their enemies, the remnants of absolute monarchy, the landowners, the non-industrial bourgeois, the petty bourgeoisie. Thus the whole historical movement is concentrated in the hands of the bourgeoisie; every victory so obtained is a victory for the bourgeoisie.

But with the development of industry the proletariat not only increases in number; it becomes concentrated in greater masses, its strength grows, and it feels that strength more. The various interests and conditions of life within the ranks of the proletariat are more and more equalised, in proportion as machinery obliterates all distinctions of labour, and nearly everywhere reduces wages to the same low level. The growing competition among the bourgeois, and the resulting commercial crises, make the wages of the workers ever more fluctuating. The unceasing improvement of machinery, ever more rapidly developing, makes their livelihood more and more precarious; the collisions between individual workmen and individual bourgeois take more and more the character of collisions between two classes. Thereupon the workers begin to form combinations (Trades' Unions) against the bourgeois; they club together in order to keep up the rate of wages; they found permanent associations in order to make provision beforehand for these occasional revolts. Here and there the contest breaks out into riots.

Now and then the workers are victorious, but only for a time. The real fruit of their battles lies, not in the immediate result, but in the ever-expanding union of the workers. This union is helped on by the improved means of communication that are created by modern industry and that place the workers of different localities in contact with one another. It was just this contact that was needed to centralise the numerous local struggles, all of the same character, into one national struggle between classes. But every class struggle is a political struggle. And that union, to attain which the burghers of the Middle Ages, with their miserable highways, required centuries, the modern proletarians, thanks to railways, achieve in a few years.

This organisation of the proletarians into a class, and consequently into a political party, is continually being upset again by the competition between the workers themselves. But it ever rises up again, stronger, firmer, mightier. It compels legislative recognition of particular interests of the workers, by taking advantage of the divisions among the bourgeoisie itself. Thus the ten-hours' bill in England was carried.

Altogether collisions between the classes of the old society

further, in many ways, the course of development of the proletariat. The bourgeoisie finds itself involved in a constant battle. At first with the aristocracy; later on, with those portions of the bourgeoisie itself, whose interests have become antagonistic to the progress of industry; at all times, with the bourgeoisie of foreign countries. In all these battles it sees itself compelled to appeal to the proletariat, to ask for its help, and thus, to drag it into the political arena. The bourgeoisie itself, therefore, supplies the proletariat with its own elements of political and general education, in other words, it furnishes the proletariat with weapons for fighting the bourgeoisie.

Further, as we have already seen, entire sections of the ruling classes are, by the advance of industry, precipitated into the proletariat, or are at least threatened in their conditions of existence. These also supply the proletariat with fresh elements of enlightenment and progress.

Finally, in times when the class struggle nears the decisive hour, the process of dissolution going on within the ruling class, in fact within the whole range of old society, assumes such a violent, glaring character, that a small section of the ruling class cuts itself adrift, and joins the revolutionary class, the class that holds the future in its hands. Just as, therefore, at an earlier period, a section of the nobility went over to the bourgeoisie, so now a portion of the bourgeoisie goes over to the proletariat, and in particular, a portion of the bourgeois ideologists, who have raised themselves to the level of comprehending theoretically the historical movement as a whole.

Of all the classes that stand face to face with the bourgeoisie today, the proletariat alone is a really revolutionary class. The other classes decay and finally disappear in the face of Modern Industry; the proletariat is its special and essential product.

The lower middle class, the small manufacturer, the shopkeeper, the artisan, the peasant, all these fight against the bourgeoisie, to save from extinction their existence as fractions of the middle class. They are therefore not revolutionary, but conservative. Nay more, they are reactionary, for they try to roll back the wheel of history. If by chance they are revolutionary, they are so only in view of

their impending transfer into the proletariat, they thus defend not their present, but their future interests, they desert their own standpoint to place themselves at that of the proletariat.

The "dangerous class", the social scum, that passively rotting mass thrown off by the lowest layers of old society may, here and there, be swept into the movement by a proletarian revolution; its conditions of life, however, prepare it far more for the part of a bribed tool of reactionary intrigue.

In the conditions of the proletariat, those of old society at large are already virtually swamped. The proletarian is without property; his relation to his wife and children has no longer anything in common with the bourgeois family relations; modern industrial labour, modern subjection to capital, the same in England as in France, in America as in Germany, has stripped him of every trace of national character. Law, morality, religion, are to him so many bourgeois prejudices, behind which lurk in ambush just as many bourgeois interests.

All the preceding classes that got the upper hand, sought to fortify their already acquired status by subjecting society at large to their conditions of appropriation. The proletarians cannot become masters of the productive forces of society, except by abolishing their own previous mode of appropriation, and thereby also every other previous mode of appropriation. They have nothing of their own to secure and to fortify; their mission is to destroy all previous securities for, and insurances of, individual property.

All previous historical movements were movements of minorities, or in the interest of minorities. The proletarian movement is the self-conscious, independent movement of the immense majority, in the interest of the immense majority. The proletariat, the lowest stratum of our present society, cannot stir, cannot raise itself up, without the whole superincumbent strata of official society being sprung into the air.

. Though not in substance, yet in form, the struggle of the proletariat with the bourgeoisie is at first a national struggle. The proletariat of each country must, of course, first of all settle matters with its own bourgeoisie.

In depicting the most general phases of the development of

the proletariat, we traced the more or less veiled civil war, raging within existing society, up to the point where that war breaks out into open revolution, and where the violent overthrow of the bourgeoisie lays the foundation for the sway of the proletariat.

Hitherto, every form of society has been based, as we have already seen, on the antagonism of oppressing and oppressed classes. But in order to oppress a class, certain conditions must be assured to it under which it can, at least, continue its slavish existence. The serf, in the period of serfdom, raised himself to membership in the commune, just as the petty bourgeois, under the yoke of feudal absolutism, managed to develop into a bourgeois. The modern labourer, on the contrary, instead of rising with the progress of industry, sinks deeper and deeper below the conditions of existence of his own class. He becomes a pauper, and pauperism develops more rapidly than population and wealth. And here it becomes evident, that the bourgeoisie is unfit any longer to be the ruling class in society, and to impose its conditions of existence upon society as an over-riding law. It is unfit to rule because it is incompetent to assure an existence to its slave within his slavery, because it cannot help letting him sink into such a state, that it has to feed him, instead of being fed by him. Society can no longer live under this bourgeoisie, in other words, its existence is no longer compatible with society.

The essential condition for the existence, and for the sway of the bourgeois class, is the formation and augmentation of capital; the condition for capital is wage-labour. Wage-labour rests exclusively on competition between the labourers. The advance of industry, whose involuntary promoter is the bourgeoisie, replaces the isolation of the labourers, due to competition, by their revolutionary combination, due to association. The development of Modern Industry, therefore, cuts from under its feet the very foundation on which the bourgeoisie produces and appropriates products. What the bourgeoisie, therefore, produces, above all, is its own grave-diggers. Its fall and the victory of the proletariat are equally inevitable.

II**PROLETARIANS AND COMMUNISTS**

In what relation do the Communists stand to the proletarians as a whole?

The Communists do not form a separate party opposed to other working-class parties.

They have no interests separate and apart from those of the proletariat as a whole.

They do not set up any sectarian principles of their own, by which to shape and mould the proletarian movement.

The Communists are distinguished from the other working-class parties by this only: 1. In the national struggles of the proletarians of the different countries, they point out and bring to the front the common interests of the entire proletariat, independently of all nationality. 2. In the various stages of development which the struggle of the working class against the bourgeoisie has to pass through, they always and everywhere represent the interests of the movement as a whole.

The Communists, therefore, are on the one hand, practically, the most advanced and resolute section of the working-class parties of every country, that section which pushes forward all others; on the other hand, theoretically, they have over the great mass of the proletariat the advantage of clearly understanding the line of march, the conditions, and the ultimate general results of the proletarian movement.

The immediate aim of the Communists is the same as that of all the other proletarian parties: formation of the proletariat into a class, overthrow of the bourgeois supremacy, conquest of political power by the proletariat.

The theoretical conclusions of the Communists are in no way based on ideas or principles that have been invented, or discovered by this or that would-be universal reformer.

They merely express, in general terms, actual relations springing from an existing class struggle, from a historical movement going on under our very eyes. The abolition of

existing property relations is not at all a distinctive feature of Communism.

All property relations in the past have continually been subject to historical change consequent upon the change in historical conditions.

The French Revolution, for example, abolished feudal property in favour of bourgeois property.

The distinguishing feature of Communism is not the abolition of property generally, but the abolition of bourgeois property. But modern bourgeois private property is the final and most complete expression of the system of producing and appropriating products, that is based on class antagonisms, on the exploitation of the many by the few.

In this sense, the theory of the Communists may be summed up in the single sentence: Abolition of private property.

We Communists have been reproached with the desire of abolishing the right of personally acquiring property as the fruit of a man's own labour, which property is alleged to be the groundwork of all personal freedom, activity and independence.

Hard-won, self-acquired, self-earned property! Do you mean the property of the petty artisan and of the small peasant, a form of property that preceded the bourgeois form? There is no need to abolish that; the development of industry has to a great extent already destroyed it, and is still destroying it daily.

Or do you mean modern bourgeois private property?

But does wage-labour create any property for the labourer? Not a bit. It creates capital, *i.e.*, that kind of property which exploits wage-labour, and which cannot increase except upon condition of begetting a new supply of wage-labour for fresh exploitation. Property, in its present form, is based on the antagonism of capital and wage-labour. Let us examine both sides of this antagonism.

To be a capitalist is to have not only a purely personal, but a social *status* in production. Capital is a collective product, and only by the united action of many members, nay, in the last resort, only by the united action of all members of society, can it be set in motion.

Capital is, therefore, not a personal, it is a social power.

When, therefore, capital is converted into common property, into the property of all members of society, personal property is not thereby transformed into social property. It is only the social character of the property that is changed. It loses its class character.

Let us now take wage-labour.

The average price of wage-labour is the minimum wage, i.e., that quantum of the means of subsistence, which is absolutely requisite to keep the labourer in bare existence as a labourer. What, therefore, the wage-labourer appropriates by means of his labour, merely suffices to prolong and reproduce a bare existence. We by no means intend to abolish this personal appropriation of the products of labour, an appropriation that is made for the maintenance and reproduction of human life, and that leaves no surplus wherewith to command the labour of others. All that we want to do away with is the miserable character of this appropriation under which the labourer lives merely to increase capital, and is allowed to live only in so far as the interest of the ruling class requires it.

In bourgeois society, living labour is but a means to increase accumulated labour. In Communist society, accumulated labour is but a means to widen, to enrich, to promote the existence of the labourer.

In bourgeois society, therefore, the past dominates the present; in Communist society, the present dominates the past. In bourgeois society capital is independent and has individuality, while the living person is dependent and has no individuality.

And the abolition of this state of things is called by the bourgeois abolition of individuality and freedom! And rightly so. The abolition of bourgeois individuality, bourgeois independence, and bourgeois freedom is undoubtedly aimed at.

By freedom is meant, under the present bourgeois conditions of production, free trade, free selling and buying.

But if selling and buying disappears, free selling and buying disappears also. This talk about free selling and buying, and all the other "brave words" of our bourgeoisie about freedom in general, have a meaning, if any, only in contrast with restricted selling and buying, with the fettered traders of the Middle Ages, but have no meaning when opposed to the

Communistic abolition of buying and selling, of the bourgeois conditions of production, and of the bourgeoisie itself.

You are horrified at our intending to do away with private property. But in your existing society, private property is already done away with for nine-tenths of the population; its existence for the few is solely due to its non-existence in the hands of those nine-tenths. You reproach us, therefore, with intending to do away with a form of property, the necessary condition for whose existence is the non-existence of any property for the immense majority of society.

In one word, you reproach us with intending to do away with your property. Precisely so; that is just what we intend.

From the moment when labour can no longer be converted into capital, money, or rent, into a social power capable of being monopolised, i.e., from the moment when individual property can no longer be transformed into bourgeois property, into capital, from that moment, you say, individuality vanishes.

You must, therefore, confess that by "individual" you mean no other person than the bourgeois, than the middle-class owner of property. This person must, indeed, be swept out of the way, and made impossible.

Communism deprives no man of the power to appropriate the products of society; all that it does is to deprive him of the power to subjugate the labour of others by means of such appropriation.

It has been objected that upon the abolition of private property all work will cease, and universal laziness will overtake us.

According to this, bourgeois society ought long ago to have gone to the dogs through sheer idleness; for those of its members who work, acquire nothing, and those who acquire anything, do not work. The whole of this objection is but another expression of the tautology: that there can no longer be any wage-labour when there is no longer any capital.

All objections urged against the Communistic mode of producing and appropriating material products, have, in the same way, been urged against the Communistic modes of producing and appropriating intellectual products. Just as, to the bourgeois, the disappearance of class property is the disappearance of production itself, so the disappearance of

class culture is to him identical with the disappearance of all culture.

That culture, the loss of which he laments, is, for the enormous majority, a mere training to act as a machine.

But don't wrangle with us so long as you apply, to our intended abolition of bourgeois property, the standard of your bourgeois notions of freedom, culture, law, &c. Your very ideas are but the outgrowth of the conditions of your bourgeois production and bourgeois property, just as your jurisprudence is but the will of your class made into a law for all, a will, whose essential character and direction are determined by the economical conditions of existence of your class.

The selfish misconception that induces you to transform into eternal laws of nature and of reason, the social forms springing from your present mode of production and form of property—historical relations that rise and disappear in the progress of production—this misconception you share with every ruling class that has preceded you. What you see clearly in the case of ancient property, what you admit in the case of feudal property, you are of course forbidden to admit in the case of your own bourgeois form of property.

Abolition of the family! Even the most radical flare up at this infamous proposal of the Communists.

On what foundation is the present family, the bourgeois family, based? On capital, on private gain. In its completely developed form this family exists only among the bourgeoisie. But this state of things finds its complement in the practical absence of the family among the proletarians, and in public prostitution.

The bourgeois family will vanish as a matter of course when its complement vanishes, and both will vanish with the vanishing of capital.

Do you charge us with wanting to stop the exploitation of children by their parents? To this crime we plead guilty.

But, you will say, we destroy the most hallowed of relations, when we replace home education by social.

And your education! Is not that also social, and determined by the social conditions under which you educate, by the intervention, direct or indirect, of society, by means of schools, &c.? The Communists have not invented the

intervention of society in education; they do but seek to alter the character of that intervention, and to rescue education from the influence of the ruling class.

The bourgeois clap-trap about the family and education, about the hallowed co-relation of parent and child, becomes all the more disgusting, the more, by the action of Modern Industry, all family ties among the proletarians are torn asunder, and their children transformed into simple articles of commerce and instruments of labour.

But you Communists would introduce community of women, screams the whole bourgeoisie in chorus.

The bourgeois sees in his wife a mere instrument of production. He hears that the instruments of production are to be exploited in common, and, naturally, can come to no other conclusion than that the lot of being common to all will likewise fall to the women.

He has not even a suspicion that the real point aimed at is to do away with the status of women as mere instruments of production.

For the rest, nothing is more ridiculous than the virtuous indignation of our bourgeois at the community of women which, they pretend, is to be openly and officially established by the Communists. The Communists have no need to introduce community of women; it has existed almost from time immemorial.

Our bourgeois, not content with having the wives and daughters of their proletarians at their disposal, not to speak of common prostitutes, take the greatest pleasure in seducing each other's wives.

Bourgeois marriage is in reality a system of wives in common and thus, at the most, what the Communists might possibly be reproached with, is that they desire to introduce, in substitution for a hypocritically concealed, an openly legalised community of women. For the rest, it is self-evident that the abolition of the present system of production must bring with it the abolition of the community of women springing from that system, i.e., of prostitution both public and private.

The Communists are further reproached with desiring to abolish countries and nationality.

The working men have no country. We cannot take from

them what they have not got. Since the proletariat must first of all acquire political supremacy, must rise to be the leading class of the nation, must constitute itself *the* nation, it is so far, itself national, though not in the bourgeois sense of the word.

National differences and antagonisms between peoples are daily more and more vanishing, owing to the development of the bourgeoisie, to freedom of commerce, to the world market, to uniformity in the mode of production and in the conditions of life corresponding thereto.

The supremacy of the proletariat will cause them to vanish still faster. United action, of the leading civilised countries at least, is one of the first conditions for the emancipation of the proletariat.

In proportion as the exploitation of one individual by another is put an end to the exploitation of one nation by another will also be put an end to. In proportion as the antagonism between classes within the nation vanishes, the hostility of one nation to another will come to an end.

The charges against Communism made from a religious, a philosophical, and, generally, from an ideological standpoint, are not deserving of serious examination.

Does it require deep intuition to comprehend that man's ideas, views and conceptions, in one word, man's consciousness, changes with every change in the conditions of his material existence, in his social relations and in his social life?

What else does the history of ideas prove, than that intellectual production changes its character in proportion as material production is changed? The ruling ideas of each age have ever been the ideas of its ruling class.

When people speak of ideas that revolutionise society, they do but express the fact, that within the old society, the elements of a new one have been created, and that the dissolution of the old ideas keeps even pace with the dissolution of the old conditions of existence.

When the ancient world was in its last throes, the ancient religions were overcome by Christianity. When Christian ideas succumbed in the 18th century to rationalist ideas, feudal society fought its death battle with the then revolutionary bourgeoisie. The ideas of religious liberty and freedom of

conscience merely gave expression to the sway of free competition within the domain of knowledge.

"Undoubtedly," it will be said, "religious, moral, philosophical and juridical ideas have been modified in the course of historical development. But religion, morality, philosophy, political science, and law, constantly survived this change."

"There are, besides, eternal truths, such as Freedom, Justice, etc., that are common to all states of society. But Communism abolishes eternal truths, it abolishes all religion and all morality, instead of constituting them on a new basis; it therefore acts in contradiction to all past historical experience."

What does this accusation reduce itself to? The history of all past society has consisted in the development of class antagonisms, antagonisms that assumed different forms at different epochs.

But whatever form they may have taken, one fact is common to all past ages, viz., the exploitation of one part of society by the other. No wonder, then, that the social consciousness of past ages, despite all the multiplicity and variety it displays, moves within certain common forms, or general ideas, which cannot completely vanish except with the total disappearance of class antagonisms.

The Communist revolution is the most radical rupture with traditional property relations; no wonder that its development involves the most radical rupture with traditional ideas.

But let us have done with the bourgeois objections to Communism.

We have seen above, that the first step in the revolution by the working class is to raise the proletariat to the position of ruling class, to win the battle of democracy.

The proletariat will use its political supremacy to wrest, by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralise all instruments of production in the hands of the State, i.e., of the proletariat organised as the ruling class; and to increase the total of productive forces as rapidly as possible.

Of course, in the beginning, this cannot be effected except by means of despotic inroads on the rights of property, and on the conditions of bourgeois production; by means of measures, therefore, which appear economically insufficient

and untenable, but which, in the course of the movement, outstrip themselves, necessitate further inroads upon the old social order, and are unavoidable as a means of entirely revolutionising the mode of production.

These measures will of course be different in different countries.

Nevertheless in the most advanced countries, the following will be pretty generally applicable:

1. Abolition of property in land and application of all rents of land to public purposes.
2. A heavy progressive or graduated income tax.
3. Abolition of all right of inheritance.
4. Confiscation of the property of all emigrants and rebels.
5. Centralisation of credit in the hand of the State, by means of a national bank with State capital and an exclusive monopoly.
6. Centralisation of the means of communication and transport in the hands of the State.
7. Extension of factories and instruments of production owned by the State; the bringing into cultivation of waste-lands and the improvement of the soil generally in accordance with a common plan.
8. Equal liability of all to labour. Establishment of industrial armies, especially for agriculture.
9. Combination of agriculture with manufacturing industries; gradual abolition of the distinction between town and country, by a more equitable distribution of the population over the country.
10. Free education for all children in public schools. Abolition of children's factory labour in its present form. Combination of education with industrial production, &c., &c.

When, in the course of development, class distinctions have disappeared, and all production has been concentrated in the hands of a vast association of the whole nation, the public power will lose its political character. Political power, properly so called, is merely the organised power of one class for oppressing another. If the proletariat during its contest with the bourgeoisie is compelled, by the force of circumstances, to organise itself as a class, if, by means of a revolution, it makes itself the ruling class, and, as such, sweeps away by force the old conditions of production, then

it will, along with these conditions, have swept away the conditions for the existence of class antagonisms and of classes generally, and will thereby have abolished its own supremacy as a class.

In place of the old bourgeois society, with its classes and class antagonisms, we shall have an association, in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all.

IV

POSITION OF THE COMMUNISTS IN RELATION OF THE VARIOUS EXISTING OPPOSITION PARTIES

Section II has made clear the relations of the Communists to the existing working-class parties, such as the Chartists in England and the Agrarian Reformers in America.

The Communists fight for the attainment of the immediate aims, for the enforcement of the momentary interests of the working class; but in the movement of the present, they also represent and take care of the future of that movement. In France the Communists ally themselves with the Social-Democrats,* against the conservative and radical bourgeoisie, reserving, however, the right to take up a critical position in regard to phrases and illusions traditionally handed down from the great Revolution.

In Switzerland they support the Radicals, without losing sight of the fact that this party consists of antagonistic elements, partly of Democratic Socialists, in the French sense, partly of radical bourgeoisie.

In Poland they support the party that insists on an agrarian revolution as the prime condition for national emancipation, that party which fomented the insurrection of Cracow in 1846.

In Germany they fight with the bourgeoisie whenever it acts in a revolutionary way, against the absolute monarchy, the feudal squires, and the petty bourgeoisie.

But they never cease, for a single instant, to instil into the working class the clearest possible recognition of the hostile antagonism between bourgeoisie and proletariat, in order that

* The party then represented in Parliament by Ledru-Rollin, in literature by Louis Blanc, in the daily press by the *Réforme*. The name of Social-Democracy signified, with these its inventors, a section of the Democratic or Republican party more or less tinged with Socialism. [Note by Engels to the English edition of 1888.]

The party in France which at that time called itself Socialist-Democratic was represented in political life by Ledru-Rollin and in literature by Louis Blanc; thus it differed immeasurably from present-day German Social-Democracy. [Note by Engels to the German edition of 1890.]

the German workers may straightway use, as so many weapons against the bourgeoisie, the social and political conditions that the bourgeoisie must necessarily introduce along with its supremacy, and in order that, after the fall of the reactionary classes in Germany, the fight against the bourgeoisie itself may immediately begin.

The Communists turn their attention, chiefly to Germany, because that country is on the eve of a bourgeois revolution that is bound to be carried out under more advanced conditions of European civilisation, and with a much more developed proletariat, than that of England was in the seventeenth, and of France in the eighteenth century, and because the bourgeois revolution in Germany will be but the prelude to an immediately following proletarian revolution.

In short, the Communists everywhere support every revolutionary movement against the existing social and political order of things.

In all these movements they bring to the front, as the leading question in each, the property question, no matter what its degree of development at the time.

Finally, they labour everywhere for the union and agreement of the democratic parties of all countries.

The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a Communistic revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win.

WORKING MEN OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!

V. I. Lenin

IN MEMORY OF THE COMMUNE

Lenin wrote this article in 1911 in commemoration of the 40th anniversary of the Paris Commune, which resulted in the world's first proletarian revolution, and in the first government of the working class. He thoroughly analysed the experience of the Commune for the international working class and all the working people.

Lenin gave special attention to clarifying the essence of the Paris Commune as a new type of state governed by workers and who profited from the economic, political, and social transformations achieved by the workers' government. This allowed to establish that only a truly popular government without exploiter capitalists could fundamentally improve the life of all the working people.

Lenin laid bare the factors that caused the Paris Commune's defeat, the basic ones being the insufficient political maturity of the French working class, which had no political party armed with the doctrine of the proletariat's class struggle; the widely heterogeneous political composition of the Paris Commune (which included bourgeois representatives); and the absence of a militant alliance of the working class and the toiling peasantry.

Lenin's profound study of the instructive lessons of the Paris Commune enriched the theory of scientific socialism and armed the international workers' movement with invaluable experience of how revolutionary renovation of the world was to be achieved. The practice of numerous countries which had accomplished proletarian revolutions has shown that the new type of state power may be embodied in different forms, e.g., in the Paris Commune, in Soviet power in the USSR, in popular democracy in the European socialist countries, and so on. Yet, its essence must be basically the same, i.e., the power of the working people.

Forty years have passed since the proclamation of the Paris Commune. In accordance with tradition, the French workers paid homage to the memory of the men and women of the revolution of March 18, 1871, by meetings and demonstrations. At the end of May they will again place wreaths on the graves of the Communards who were shot, the victims of the terrible "May Week", and over their graves they will once more vow to fight untiringly until their ideas have triumphed and the cause they bequeathed has been fully achieved.

Why does the proletariat, not only in France but throughout the entire world, honour the men and women of the Paris Commune as their predecessors? And what is the heritage of the Commune?

The Commune sprang up spontaneously. No one consciously prepared it in an organised way. The unsuccessful war with Germany, the privations suffered during the siege, the unemployment among the proletariat and the ruin among the lower middle classes; the indignation of the masses against the upper classes and against authorities who had displayed utter incompetence, the vague unrest among the working class, which was discontented with its lot and was striving for a different social system; the reactionary composition of the National Assembly, which roused apprehensions as to the fate of the republic--all this and many other factors combined to drive the population of Paris to revolution on March 18, which unexpectedly placed power in the hands of the National Guard, in the hands of the working class and the petty bourgeoisie which had sided with it.

It was an event unprecedented in history. Up to that time power had, as a rule, been in the hands of landowners and capitalists, i.e., in the hands of their trusted agents who made up the so-called government. After the revolution of March 18, when M. Thiers' government had fled from Paris with its troops, its police and its officials, the people became

masters of the situation and power passed into the hands of the proletariat. But in modern society, the proletariat, economically enslaved by capital, cannot dominate politically unless it breaks the chains which fetter it to capital. That is why the movement of the Commune was bound to take on a socialist tinge, i.e., to strive to overthrow the rule of the bourgeoisie, the rule of capital, and to destroy the very foundations of the contemporary social order.

At first this movement was extremely indefinite and confused. It was joined by patriots who hoped that the Commune would renew the war with the Germans and bring it to a successful conclusion. It enjoyed the support of the small shopkeepers who were threatened with ruin unless there was a postponement of payments on debts and rent (the government refused to grant this postponement, but they obtained it from the Commune). Finally, it enjoyed, at first, the sympathy of bourgeois republicans who feared that the reactionary National Assembly (the "rustics", the savage landlords) would restore the monarchy. But it was of course the workers (especially the artisans of Paris), among whom active socialist propaganda had been carried on during the last years of the Second Empire and many of whom even belonged to the International, who played the principal part in this movement.

Only the workers remained loyal to the Commune to the end. The bourgeois republicans and the petty bourgeoisie soon broke away from it: the former were frightened off by the revolutionary-socialist, proletarian character of the movement; the latter broke away when they saw that it was doomed to inevitable defeat. Only the French proletarians supported their government fearlessly and untiringly, they alone fought and died for it—that is to say, for the cause of the emancipation of the working class, for a better future for all toilers.

Deserted by its former allies and left without support, the Commune was doomed to defeat. The entire bourgeoisie of France, all the landlords, stockbrokers, factory owners, all the robbers, great and small, all the exploiters joined forces against it. This bourgeois coalition, supported by Bismarck (who released a hundred thousand French prisoners of war to help crush revolutionary Paris), succeeded in rousing the

ignorant peasants and the petty bourgeoisie of the provinces against the proletariat of Paris, and forming a ring of steel around half of Paris (the other half was besieged by the German army). In some of the larger cities in France (Marseilles, Lyons, St. Étienne, Dijon, etc.) the workers also attempted to seize power, to proclaim the Commune and come to the help of Paris; but these attempts were short-lived. Paris, which had first raised the banner of proletarian revolt, was left to its own resources and doomed to certain destruction.

Two conditions, at least, are necessary for a victorious social revolution—highly developed productive forces and a proletariat adequately prepared for it. But in 1871 both of these conditions were lacking. French capitalism was still poorly developed, and France was at that time mainly a petty-bourgeois country (artisans, peasants, shopkeepers, etc.). On the other hand, there was no workers' party; the working class had not gone through a long school of struggle and was unprepared, and for the most part did not even clearly visualise its tasks and the methods of fulfilling them. There was no serious political organisation of the proletariat, nor were there strong trade unions and co-operative societies...

But the chief thing which the Commune lacked was time—an opportunity to take stock of the situation and to embark upon the fulfilment of its programme. It had scarcely had time to start work, when the government entrenched in Versailles and supported by the entire bourgeoisie began hostilities against Paris. The Commune had to concentrate primarily on self-defence. Right up to the very end, May 21-28, it had no time to think seriously of anything else.

However, in spite of these unfavourable conditions, in spite of its brief existence, the Commune managed to promulgate a few measures which sufficiently characterise its real significance and aims. The Commune did away with the standing army, that blind weapon in the hands of the ruling classes, and armed the whole people. It proclaimed the separation of church and state, abolished state payments to religious bodies (i.e., state salaries for priests), made popular education purely secular, and in this way struck a severe blow at the gendarmes in cassocks. In the purely social sphere the

Commune accomplished very little, but this little nevertheless clearly reveals its character as a popular, workers' government. Night-work in bakeries was forbidden; the system of fines, which represented legalised robbery of the workers, was abolished. Finally, there was the famous decree that all factories and workshops abandoned or shut down by their owners were to be turned over to associations of workers that were to resume production. And, as if to emphasise its character as a truly democratic, proletarian government, the Commune decreed that the salaries of all administrative and government officials, irrespective of rank, should not exceed the normal wages of a worker, and in no case amount to more than 6,000 francs a year (less than 200 rubles a month).

All these measures showed clearly enough that the Commune was a deadly menace to the old world founded on the enslavement and exploitation of the people. That was why bourgeois society could not feel at ease so long as the Red Flag of the proletariat waved over the *Hôtel de Ville* in Paris. And when the organised forces of the government finally succeeded in gaining the upper hand over the poorly organised forces of the revolution, the Bonapartist generals, who had been beaten by the Germans and who showed courage only in fighting their defeated countrymen, those French Rennenkamps and Meller-Zakomelskys, organised such a slaughter as Paris had never known. About 30,000 Parisians were shot down by the bestial soldiery, and about 45,000 were arrested, many of whom were afterwards executed, while thousands were transported or exiled. In all, Paris lost about 100,000 of its best people, including some of the finest workers in all trades.

The bourgeoisie were satisfied. "Now we have finished with socialism for a long time," said their leader, the blood-thirsty dwarf, Thiers, after he and his generals had drowned the proletariat of Paris in blood. But these bourgeois crows croaked in vain. Less than six years after the suppression of the Commune, when many of its champions were still pining in prison or in exile, a new working-class movement arose in France. A new socialist generation, enriched by the experience of their predecessors and no whit discouraged by their defeat, picked up the flag which had fallen from the hands of the fighters in the cause of the Commune and bore it boldly

and confidently forward. Their battle-cry was: "Long live the social revolution! Long live the Commune!" And in another few years, the new workers' party and the agitational work launched by it throughout the country compelled the ruling classes to release Communards who were still kept in prison by the government.

The memory of the fighters of the Commune is honoured not only by the workers of France but by the proletariat of the whole world. For the Commune fought, not for some local or narrow national aim, but for the emancipation of all toiling humanity, of all the downtrodden and oppressed. As a foremost fighter for the social revolution, the Commune has won sympathy wherever there is a proletariat suffering and engaged in struggle. The epic of its life and death, the sight of a workers' government which seized the capital of the world and held it for over two months, the spectacle of the heroic struggle of the proletariat and the torments it underwent after its defeat—all this raised the spirit of millions of workers, aroused their hopes and enlisted their sympathy for the cause of socialism. The thunder of the cannon in Paris awakened the most backward sections of the proletariat from their deep slumber, and everywhere gave impetus to the growth of revolutionary socialist propaganda. That is why the cause of the Commune is not dead. It lives to the present day in every one of us.

The cause of the Commune is the cause of the social revolution, the cause of the complete political and economic emancipation of the toilers. It is the cause of the proletariat of the whole world. And in this sense it is immortal.

V. I. Lenin

From: THE STATE AND REVOLUTION

Lenin wrote this work in 1917 when the Great October Socialist Revolution was in preparation in Russia. The book contains six chapters, which expound and creatively develop the Marxist teaching on the state, on socialist revolution, and on socialism and communism. Cited below is Chapter V (*The Economic Basis of the Withering Away of the State*).

Basing himself on Marx's and Engels' teaching, Lenin examined a fundamental question of scientific communism, namely what would happen with state power during the transition of capitalist society to communist society. He showed that a proletarian revolution would overthrow the bourgeois power, which is essentially a democracy for the minority, i.e., for private owners of the means of production who exploit other people, and at the same time a machine for oppressing the majority. The bourgeois state would be replaced by a new type of state, viz. the dictatorship of the proletariat, wherein one can clearly distinguish two aspects. On the one hand, in the early stages of the proletarian revolution, the working class would use the state to suppress the resistance of the overthrown exploiter classes and, on the other, true sovereignty of the people would be established for the first time in history. As a result, the majority of people would gain democracy whereby the working people would be free from all kinds of oppression and from exploitation of man by man.

Lenin showed that the new society would consecutively pass through two stages of development, viz. through socialism and communism, the former being the lower phase, and the latter the higher phase in society's economic, political and cultural advance. Under socialism, all the working people would be equal to the means of production owned by society. At the same time, they would receive consumer items depending on the measure of work by each individual in conformity with the socialist principle: "From each according to his ability, to

each according to his work". In this case, the state would be necessary, for it would control the measure of labour and consumption by every individual worker.

Lenin revealed the prerequisites for the state's disappearance in the higher phase of communism, namely enormous growth of productive forces and labour productivity; elimination of distinctions between mental and manual labour and all-round development of all the people involved; abundant material wealth; higher cultural level and people's consciousness; and transformation of labour into a vital need of all members in society. Another point of major significance would also be increasingly general participation of the working people in administering all the affairs of society. Lenin also noted, that when social self-government had become established, and work for the common good habitual for all, the door would be widely open for transition from socialism to communism, to the principle "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs" and to subsequent complete disappearance of the state.

Chapter V

THE ECONOMIC BASIS OF THE WITHERING AWAY OF THE STATE

Marx explains this question most thoroughly in his *Critique of the Gotha Programme* (letter to Bracke, May 5, 1875, which was not published until 1891 when it was printed in *Neue Zeit*, Vol. IX, 1, and which has appeared in Russian in a special edition). The polemical part of this remarkable work, which contains a criticism of Lassalleism, has, so to speak, overshadowed its positive part, namely, the analysis of the connection between the development of communism and the withering away of the state.

1. PRESENTATION OF THE QUESTION BY MARX

From a superficial comparison of Marx's letter to Bracke of May 5, 1875, with Engels's letter to Bebel of March 28, 1875, which we examined above, it might appear that Marx was much more of a "champion of the state" than Engels, and that the difference of opinion between the two writers on the question of the state was very considerable.

Engels suggested to Bebel that all chatter about the state be dropped altogether, that the word "state" be eliminated from the programme altogether and the word "community" substituted for it. Engels even declared that the Commune was no longer a state in the proper sense of the word. Yet Marx even spoke of the "future state in communist society", i.e., he would seem to recognise the need for the state even under communism.

But such a view would be fundamentally wrong. A closer examination shows that Marx's and Engels's views on the state and its withering away were completely identical, and that Marx's expression quoted above refers to the state in the process of withering away.

Clearly there can be no question of specifying the moment of the future "withering away", the more so since it will obviously be a lengthy process. The apparent difference

between Marx and Engels is due to the fact that they dealt with different subjects and pursued different aims. Engels set out to show Bebel graphically, sharply and in broad outline the utter absurdity of the current prejudices concerning the state (shared to no small degree by Lassalle). Marx only touched upon *this* question in passing, being interested in another subject, namely, the *development* of communist society.

The whole theory of Marx is the application of the theory of development—in its most consistent, complete, considered and pithy form—to modern capitalism. Naturally, Marx was faced with the problem of applying this theory both to the *forthcoming* collapse of capitalism and to the *future* development of *future* communism.

On the basis of what *facts*, then, can the question of the future development of future communism be dealt with?

On the basis of the fact that it *has its origin* in capitalism, that it develops historically from capitalism, that it is the result of the action of a social force to which capitalism *gave birth*. There is no trace of an attempt on Marx's part to make up a utopia, to indulge in idle guess-work about what cannot be known. Marx treated the question of communism in the same way as a naturalist would treat the question of the development of, say, a new biological variety once he knew that it had originated in such and such a way and was changing in such and such a definite direction.

To begin with, Marx brushed aside the confusion the Gotha Programme brought into the question of the relationship between state and society. He wrote:

"'Present-day society' is capitalist society, which exists in all civilised countries, being more or less free from medieval admixture, more or less modified by the particular historical development of each country, more or less developed. On the other hand, the 'present-day state' changes with a country's frontier. It is different in the Prusso-German Empire from what it is in Switzerland, and different in England from what it is in the United States. 'The present-day state' is, therefore, a fiction.

"Nevertheless, the different states of the different civilised countries, in spite of their motley diversity of form, all have this in common, that they are based on modern bourgeois

society, only one more or less capitalistically developed. They have, therefore, also certain essential characteristics in common. In this sense it is possible to speak of the 'present-day state', in contrast with the future, in which its present root, bourgeois society, will have died off.

"The question then arises: what transformation will the state undergo in communist society? In other words, what social functions will remain in existence there that are analogous to present state functions? This question can only be answered scientifically, and one does not get a flea-hop nearer to the problem by a thousand-fold combination of the word people with the word state."

After thus ridiculing all talk about a "people's state", Marx formulated the question and gave warning, as it were, that those seeking a scientific answer to it should use only firmly-established scientific data.

The first fact that has been established most accurately by the whole theory of development, by science as a whole—a fact that was ignored by the utopians, and is ignored by the present-day opportunists, who are afraid of the socialist revolution—is that, historically, there must undoubtedly be a special stage, or a special phase, of *transition* from capitalism to communism.

2. THE TRANSITION FROM CAPITALISM TO COMMUNISM

Marx continued:

"Between capitalist and communist society lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. Corresponding to this is also a political transition period in which the state can be nothing but *the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat*."

Marx bases this conclusion on an analysis of the role played by the proletariat in modern capitalist society, on the data concerning the development of this society, and on the irreconcilability of the antagonistic interests of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie.

Previously the question was put as follows: to achieve its emancipation, the proletariat must overthrow the bourgeoisie, win political power and establish its revolutionary dictatorship.

Now the question is put somewhat differently: the transition from capitalist society—which is developing towards communism—to communist society is impossible without a “political transition period”, and the state in this period can only be the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat.

What, then, is the relation of this dictatorship to democracy?

We have seen that the *Communist Manifesto* simply places side by side the two concepts: “to raise the proletariat to the position of the ruling class” and “to win the battle of democracy”. On the basis of all that has been said above, it is possible to determine more precisely how democracy changes in the transition from capitalism to communism.

In capitalist society, providing it develops under the most favourable conditions, we have a more or less complete democracy in the democratic republic. But this democracy is always hemmed in by the narrow limits set by capitalist exploitation, and consequently always remains, in effect, a democracy for the minority, only for the propertied classes, only for the rich. Freedom in capitalist society always remains about the same as it was in the ancient Greek republics: freedom for the slave-owners. Owing to the conditions of capitalist exploitation, the modern wage slaves are so crushed by want and poverty that “they cannot be bothered with democracy”, “cannot be bothered with politics”; in the ordinary, peaceful course of events, the majority of the population is debarred from participation in public and political life.

The correctness of this statement is perhaps most clearly confirmed by Germany, because constitutional legality steadily endured there for a remarkably long time—nearly half a century (1871-1914)—and during this period the Social-Democrats were able to achieve far more than in other countries in the way of “utilising legality”, and organised a larger proportion of the workers into a political party than anywhere else in the world.

What is this largest proportion of politically conscious and active wage slaves that has so far been recorded in capitalist society? One million members of the Social-Democratic Party—out of fifteen million wage-workers! Three million organised in trade unions—out of fifteen million!

Democracy for an insignificant minority, democracy for the rich—that is the democracy of capitalist society. If we look more closely into the machinery of capitalist democracy, we see everywhere, in the “petty”—supposedly petty—details of the suffrage (residential qualification, exclusion of women, etc.), in the technique of the representative institutions, in the actual obstacles to the right of assembly (public buildings are not for “paupers”!), in the purely capitalist organisation of the daily press, etc., etc.—we see restriction after restriction upon democracy. These restrictions, exceptions, exclusions, obstacles for the poor seem slight, especially in the eyes of one who has never known want himself and has never been in close contact with the oppressed classes in their mass life (and nine out of ten, if not ninety-nine out of a hundred, bourgeois publicists and politicians come under this category); but in their sum total these restrictions exclude and squeeze out the poor from politics, from active participation in democracy.

Marx grasped this *essence* of capitalist democracy splendidly when, in analysing the experience of the Commune, he said that the oppressed are allowed once every few years to decide which particular representative of the oppressing class shall represent and repress them in parliament!

But from this capitalist democracy—that is inevitably narrow and stealthily pushes aside the poor, and is therefore hypocritical and false through and through—forward development does not proceed simply, directly and smoothly, towards “greater and greater democracy”, as the liberal professors and petty-bourgeois opportunists would have us believe. No, forward development, i.e., development towards communism, proceeds through the dictatorship of the proletariat, and cannot do otherwise, for the *resistance* of the capitalist exploiters cannot be *broken* by anyone else or in any other way.

And the dictatorship of the proletariat, i.e., the organisation of the vanguard of the oppressed as the ruling class for the purpose of suppressing the oppressors, cannot result merely in an expansion of democracy. *Simultaneously* with an immense expansion of democracy, which *for the first time* becomes democracy for the poor, democracy for the people, and not democracy for the money-bags, the dictatorship of

the proletariat imposes a series of restrictions on the freedom of the oppressors, the exploiters, the capitalists. We must suppress them in order to free humanity from wage slavery, their resistance must be crushed by force; it is clear that there is no freedom and no democracy where there is suppression and where there is violence.

Engels expressed this splendidly in his letter to Bebel when he said, as the reader will remember, that "the proletariat needs the state, not in the interests of freedom but in order to hold down its adversaries, and as soon as it becomes possible to speak of freedom the state as such ceases to exist."

Democracy for the vast majority of the people, and suppression by force, i.e., exclusion from democracy, of the exploiters and oppressors of the people—this is the change democracy undergoes during the *transition* from capitalism to communism.

Only in communist society, when the resistance of the capitalists has been completely crushed, when the capitalists have disappeared, when there are no classes (i.e., when there is no distinction between the members of society as regards their relation to the social means of production), *only then* "the state ... ceases to exist", and "*it becomes possible to speak of freedom*". Only then will a truly complete democracy become possible and be realised, a democracy without any exceptions whatever. And only then will democracy begin to *wither away*, owing to the simple fact that, freed from capitalist slavery, from the untold horrors, savagery, absurdities and infamies of capitalist exploitation, people will gradually *become accustomed* to observing the elementary rules of social intercourse that have been known for centuries and repeated for thousands of years in all copybook maxims. They will become accustomed to observing them without force, without coercion, without subordination, *without the special apparatus* for coercion called the state.

The expression "the state *withers away*" is very well chosen, for it indicates both the gradual and the spontaneous nature of the process. Only habit can, and undoubtedly will, have such an effect; for we see around us on millions of occasions how readily people become accustomed to observing the necessary rules of social intercourse when there is no exploitation, when there is nothing that arouses indignation.

evokes protest and revolt, and creates the need for *suppression*.

And so in capitalist society we have a democracy that is curtailed, wretched, false, a democracy only for the rich, for the minority. The dictatorship of the proletariat, the period of transition to communism, will for the first time create democracy for the people, for the majority, along with the necessary suppression of the exploiters, of the minority. Communism alone is capable of providing really complete democracy, and the more complete it is, the sooner it will become unnecessary and wither away of its own accord.

In other words, under capitalism we have the state in the proper sense of the word, that is, a special machine for the suppression of one class by another, and, what is more, of the majority by the minority. Naturally, to be successful, such an undertaking as the systematic suppression of the exploited majority by the exploiting minority calls for the utmost ferocity and savagery in the matter of suppressing, it calls for seas of blood, through which mankind is actually wading its way in slavery, serfdom and wage labour.

Furthermore, during the *transition* from capitalism to communism suppression is *still* necessary, but it is now the suppression of the exploiting minority by the exploited majority. A special apparatus, a special machine for suppression, the "state", is *still* necessary, but this is now a transitional state. It is no longer a state in the proper sense of the word; for the suppression of the minority of exploiters by the majority of the wage slaves of *yesterday* is comparatively so easy, simple and natural a task that it will entail far less bloodshed than the suppression of the risings of slaves, serfs or wage-labourers, and it will cost mankind far less. And it is compatible with the extension of democracy to such an overwhelming majority of the population that the need for a *special machine* of suppression will begin to disappear. Naturally, the exploiters are unable to suppress the people without a highly complex machine for performing this task, but *the people* can suppress the exploiters even with a very simple "machine", almost without a "machine", without a special apparatus, by the simple *organisation of the armed people* (such as the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, we would remark, running ahead).

Lastly, only communism makes the state absolutely unnecessary, for there is *nobody* to be suppressed—"nobody" in the sense of a *class*, of a systematic struggle against a definite section of the population. We are not utopians, and do not in the least deny the possibility and inevitability of excesses on the part of *individual persons*, or the need to stop such excesses. In the first place, however, no special machine, no special apparatus of suppression, is needed for this; this will be done by the armed people themselves, as simply and as readily as any crowd of civilised people, even in modern society, interferes to put a stop to a scuffle or to prevent a woman from being assaulted. And, secondly, we know that the fundamental social cause of excesses, which consist in the violation of the rules of social intercourse, is the exploitation of the people, their want and their poverty. With the removal of this chief cause, excesses will inevitably begin to "*wither away*". We do not know how quickly and in what succession, but we do know they will wither away. With their withering away the state will also *wither away*.

Without building utopias, Marx defined more fully what can be defined now regarding this future, namely, the difference between the lower and higher phases (levels, stages) of communist society.

3. THE FIRST PHASE OF COMMUNIST SOCIETY

In the *Critique of the Gotha Programme*, Marx goes into detail to disprove Lassalle's idea that under socialism the worker will receive the "undiminished" or "full product of his labour". Marx shows that from the whole of the social labour of society there must be deducted a reserve fund, a fund for the expansion of production, a fund for the replacement of the "wear and tear" of machinery, and so on. Then, from the means of consumption must be deducted a fund for administrative expenses, for schools, hospitals, old people's homes, and so on.

Instead of Lassalle's hazy, obscure, general phrase ("the full product of his labour to the worker"), Marx makes a sober estimate of exactly how socialist society will have to manage its affairs. Marx proceeds to make a *concrete* analysis

of the conditions of life of a society in which there will be no capitalism, and says:

"What we have to deal with here [in analysing the programme of the workers' party] is a communist society, not as it has *developed* on its own foundations, but, on the contrary, just as it *emerges* from capitalist society; which is thus in every respect, economically, morally and intellectually, still stamped with the birthmarks of the old society from whose womb it comes".

It is this communist society, which has just emerged into the light of day out of the womb of capitalism and which is in every respect stamped with the birthmarks of the old society, that Marx terms the "first", or lower, phase of communist society.

The means of production are no longer the private property of individuals. The means of production belong to the whole of society. Every member of society, performing a certain part of the socially-necessary work, receives a certificate from society to the effect that he has done a certain amount of work. And with this certificate he receives from the public store of consumer goods a corresponding quantity of products. After a deduction is made of the amount of labour which goes to the public fund, every worker, therefore, receives from society as much as he has given to it.

"Equality" apparently reigns supreme.

But when Lassalle, having in view such a social order (usually called socialism, but termed by Marx the first phase of communism), says that this is "equitable distribution", that this is "the equal right of all to an equal product of labour", Lassalle is mistaken and Marx exposes the mistake.

"Hence, the equal right," says Marx, in this case *still* certainly conforms to "bourgeois law", which, like all law, *implies inequality*. All law is an application of an *equal* measure to *different* people who in fact are not alike, are not equal to one another. That is why the "equal right" is a violation of equality and an injustice. In fact, everyone, having performed as much social labour as another, receives an equal share of the social product (after the above-mentioned deductions).

But people are not alike: one is strong, another is weak; one is married, another is not; one has more children, another

has less, and so on. And the conclusion Marx draws is:

"...With an equal performance of labour, and hence an equal share in the social consumption fund, one will in fact receive more than another, one will be richer than another, and so on. To avoid all these defects, the right instead of being equal would have to be unequal."

The first phase of communism, therefore, cannot yet provide justice and equality: differences, and unjust differences, in wealth will still persist, but the *exploitation* of man by man will have become impossible because it will be impossible to seize the *means of production*—the factories, machines, land, etc.—and make them private property. In smashing Lassalle's petty-bourgeois, vague phrases about "equality" and "justice" in general, Marx shows the *course of development* of communist society, which is *compelled* to abolish at first *only* the "injustice" of the means of production seized by individuals, and which is *unable* at once to eliminate the other injustice, which consists in the distribution of consumer goods "according to the amount of labour performed" (and not according to needs).

The vulgar economists, including the bourgeois professors and "our" Tugan, constantly reproach the socialists with forgetting the inequality of people and with "dreaming" of eliminating this inequality. Such a reproach, as we see, only proves the extreme ignorance of the bourgeois ideologists.

Marx not only most scrupulously takes account of the inevitable inequality of men, but he also takes into account the fact that the mere conversion of the means of production into the common property of the whole of society (commonly called "socialism") *does not remove* the defects of distribution and the inequality of "bourgeois law", which *continues to prevail* so long as products are divided "according to the amount of labour performed". Continuing, Marx says:

"But these defects are inevitable in the first phase of communist society as it is when it has just emerged, after prolonged birth pangs, from capitalist society. Law can never be higher than the economic structure of society and its cultural development conditioned thereby."

And so, in the first phase of communist society (usually called socialism) "bourgeois law" is *not* abolished in its entirety, but only in part, only in proportion to the economic

revolution so far attained, i.e., only in respect of the means of production. "Bourgeois law" recognises them as the private property of individuals. Socialism converts them into *common* property. *To that extent—and to that extent alone—"bourgeois law" disappears.*

However, it persists as far as its other part is concerned; it persists in the capacity of regulator (determining factor) in the distribution of products and the allotment of labour among the members of society. The socialist principle, "He who does not work shall not eat", is *already* realised; the other socialist principle, "An equal amount of products for an equal amount of labour", is also *already* realised. But this is not yet communism, and it does not yet abolish "bourgeois law", which gives unequal individuals, in return for unequal (really unequal) amounts of labour, equal amounts of products.

This is a "defect", says Marx, but it is unavoidable in the first phase of communism; for if we are not to indulge in utopianism, we must not think that having overthrown capitalism people will at once learn to work for society *without any rules of law*. Besides, the abolition of capitalism *does not immediately create* the economic prerequisites for such a change.

Now, there are no other rules than those of "bourgeois law". To this extent, therefore, there still remains the need for a state, which, while safeguarding the common ownership of the means of production, would safeguard equality in labour and in the distribution of products.

The state withers away insofar as there are no longer any capitalists, any classes, and, consequently, no *class* can be suppressed.

But the state has not yet completely withered away, since there still remains the safeguarding of "bourgeois law", which sanctifies actual inequality. For the state to wither away completely, complete communism is necessary.

4. THE HIGHER PHASE OF COMMUNIST SOCIETY

Marx continues:

"In a higher phase of communist society, after the enslaving subordination of the individual to the division of labour, and with it also the antithesis between mental and physical labour,

has vanished, after labour has become not only a livelihood but life's prime want, after the productive forces have increased with the all-round development of the individual, and all the springs of co-operative wealth flow more abundantly—only then can the narrow horizon of bourgeois law be left behind in its entirety and society inscribe on its banners: From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs!"

Only now can we fully appreciate the correctness of Engels's remarks mercilessly ridiculing the absurdity of combining the words "freedom" and "state". So long as the state exists there is no freedom. When there is freedom, there will be no state.

The economic basis for the complete withering away of the state is such a high stage of development of communism at which the antithesis between mental and physical labour disappears, at which there consequently disappears one of the principal sources of modern *social* inequality—a source, moreover, which cannot on any account be removed immediately by the mere conversion of the means of production into public property, by the mere expropriation of the capitalists.

This expropriation will make it *possible* for the productive forces to develop to a tremendous extent. And when we see how incredibly capitalism is already *retarding* this development, when we see how much progress could be achieved on the basis of the level of technique already attained, we are entitled to say with the fullest confidence that the expropriation of the capitalists will inevitably result in an enormous development of the productive forces of human society. But how rapidly this development will proceed, how soon it will reach the point of breaking away from the division of labour, of doing away with the antithesis between mental and physical labour, of transforming labour into "life's prime want"—we do not and *cannot* know.

That is why we are entitled to speak only of the inevitable withering away of the state, emphasising the protracted nature of this process and its dependence upon the rapidity of development of the *higher phase* of communism, and leaving the question of the time required for, or the concrete forms of, the withering away quite open, because there is *no*

material for answering these questions.

The state will be able to wither away completely when society adopts the rule: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs", i.e., when people have become so accustomed to observing the fundamental rules of social intercourse and when their labour has become so productive that they will voluntarily work *according to their ability*. "The narrow horizon of bourgeois law", which compels one to calculate with the heartlessness of a Shylock whether one has not worked half an hour more than somebody else, whether one is not getting less pay than somebody else—this narrow horizon will then be left behind. There will then be no need for society, in distributing the products, to regulate the quantity to be received by each; each will take freely "according to his needs".

From the bourgeois point of view, it is easy to declare that such a social order is "sheer utopia" and to sneer at the socialists for promising everyone the right to receive from society, without any control over the labour of the individual citizen, any quantity of truffles, cars, pianos, etc. Even to this day, most bourgeois "savants" confine themselves to sneering in this way, thereby betraying both their ignorance and their selfish defence of capitalism.

Ignorance—for it has never entered the head of any socialist to "promise" that the higher phase of the development of communism will arrive; as for the great socialists' *forecast* that it will arrive, it presupposes not the present productivity of labour and *not the present* ordinary run of people, who, like the seminarists in Pomyalovsky's stories, are capable of damaging the stocks of public wealth "just for fun", and of demanding the impossible.

Until the "higher" phase of communism arrives, the socialists demand the *strictest* control by society and by the state over the measure of labour and the measure of consumption; but this control must *start* with the expropriation of the capitalists, with the establishment of workers' control over the capitalists, and must be exercised not by a state of bureaucrats, but by a state of *armed workers*.

The selfish defence of capitalism by the bourgeois ideologists (and their hangers-on, like the Tseretelis, Chernovs and Co.) consists in that they *substitute* arguing and talk about the

distant future for the vital and burning question of *present-day politics*, namely, the expropriation of the capitalists, the conversion of *all citizens* into workers and other employees of *one huge "syndicate"*—the whole state—and the complete subordination of the entire work of this syndicate to a genuinely democratic state, *the state of the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies*.

In fact, when a learned professor, followed by the philistine, followed in turn by the Tseretelis and Chernovs, talks of wild utopias, of the demagogic promises of the Bolsheviks, of the impossibility of "introducing" socialism, it is the higher stage, or phase, of communism he has in mind, which no one has ever promised or even thought to "introduce", because, generally speaking, it cannot be "introduced".

And this brings us to the question of the scientific distinction between socialism and communism which Engels touched on in his above-quoted argument about the incorrectness of the name "Social-Democrat". Politically, the distinction between the first, or lower, and the higher phase of communism, will in time, probably, be tremendous. But it would be ridiculous to recognise this distinction now, under capitalism, and only individual anarchists, perhaps, could invest it with primary importance (if there still are people among the anarchists who have learned nothing from the "Plekhanov" conversion of the Kropotkins, of Grave, CorNELISEN and other "stars" of anarchism into social-chauvinists, or into "anarcho-trenchists", as Ghe, one of the few anarchists who have still preserved a sense of honour and a conscience, has put it).

But the scientific distinction between socialism and communism is clear. What is usually called socialism was termed by Marx the "first", or lower, phase of communist society. Insofar as the means of production become *common* property, the word "communism" is also applicable here, providing we do not forget that this is *not* complete communism. The great significance of Marx's explanations is that here, too, he consistently applies materialist dialectics, the theory of development, and regards communism as something which develops *out of* capitalism. Instead of scholastically invented, "concocted" definitions and fruitless disputes over words

(What is socialism? What is communism?), Marx gives an analysis of what might be called the stages of the economic maturity of communism.

In its first phase, or first stage, communism *cannot* as yet be fully mature economically and entirely free from traditions or vestiges of capitalism. Hence the interesting phenomenon that communism in its first phase retains "the narrow horizon of *bourgeois law*". Of course, bourgeois law in regard to the distribution of *consumer* goods inevitably presupposes the existence of the *bourgeois state*, for law is nothing without an apparatus capable of *enforcing* the observance of the rules of law.

It follows that under communism there remains for a time not only bourgeois law, but even the bourgeois state, without the bourgeoisie!

This may sound like a paradox or simply a dialectical conundrum, of which Marxism is often accused by people who have not taken the slightest trouble to study its extraordinarily profound content.

But in fact, remnants of the old, surviving in the new, confront us in life at every step, both in nature and in society. And Marx did not arbitrarily insert a scrap of "bourgeois" law into communism, but indicated what is economically and politically inevitable in a society emerging *out of the womb* of capitalism.

Democracy is of enormous importance to the working class in its struggle against the capitalists for its emancipation. But democracy is by no means a boundary not to be overstepped; it is only one of the stages on the road from feudalism to capitalism, and from capitalism to communism.

Democracy means equality. The great significance of the proletariat's struggle for equality and of equality as a slogan will be clear if we correctly interpret it as meaning the abolition of *classes*. But democracy means only *formal* equality. And as soon as equality is achieved for all members of society *in relation* to ownership of the means of production, that is, equality of labour and wages, humanity will inevitably be confronted with the question of advancing farther, from formal equality to actual equality, i.e., to the operation of the rule "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs". By what stages, by means of

what practical measures humanity will proceed to this supreme aim we do not and cannot know. But it is important to realise how infinitely mendacious is the ordinary bourgeois conception of socialism as something lifeless, rigid, fixed once and for all, whereas in reality *only* socialism will be the beginning of a rapid, genuine, truly mass forward movement, embracing first the *majority* and then the whole of the population, in all spheres of public and private life.

Democracy is a form of the state, one of its varieties. Consequently, like every state, it represents, on the one hand, the organised, systematic use of force against persons; but, on the other hand, it signifies the formal recognition of equality of citizens, the equal right of all to determine the structure of, and to administer, the state. This, in turn, results in the fact that, at a certain stage in the development of democracy, it first welds together the class that wages a revolutionary struggle against capitalism—the proletariat, and enables it to crush, smash to atoms, wipe off the face of the earth the bourgeois, even the republican-bourgeois, state machine, the standing army, the police and the bureaucracy and to substitute for them a *more* democratic state machine, but a state machine nevertheless, in the shape of armed workers who proceed to form a militia involving the entire population.

Here “quantity turns into quality”: such a degree of democracy implies overstepping the boundaries of bourgeois society and beginning its socialist reorganisation. If really *all* take part in the administration of the state, capitalism cannot retain its hold. The development of capitalism, in turn, creates the *preconditions* that *enable* really “all” to take part in the administration of the state. Some of these preconditions are: universal literacy, which has already been achieved in a number of the most advanced capitalist countries, then the “training and disciplining” of millions of workers by the huge, complex, socialised apparatus of the postal service, railways, big factories, large-scale commerce, banking, etc., etc.

Given these *economic* preconditions, it is quite possible, after the overthrow of the capitalists and the bureaucrats, to proceed immediately, overnight, to replace them in the *control* over production and distribution, in the work of *keeping account* of labour and products, by the armed workers, by the whole of the armed population. (The question

of control and accounting should not be confused with the question of the scientifically trained staff of engineers, agronomists and so on. These gentlemen are working today in obedience to the wishes of the capitalists, and will work even better tomorrow in obedience to the wishes of the armed workers).

Accounting and control—that is *mainly* what is needed for the “smooth working”, for the proper functioning, of the *first phase* of communist society. All citizens are transformed into hired employees of the state, which consists of the armed workers. All citizens become employees and workers of a *single* country-wide state “syndicate”. All that is required is that they should work equally, do their proper share of work, and get equal pay. The accounting and control necessary for this have been *simplified* by capitalism to the utmost and reduced to the extraordinarily simple operations—which any literate person can perform—of supervising and recording, knowledge of the four rules of arithmetic, and issuing appropriate receipts.*

When the *majority* of the people begin independently and everywhere to keep such accounts and exercise such control over the capitalists (now converted into employees) and over the intellectual gentry who preserve their capitalist habits, this control will really become universal, general and popular: and there will be no getting away from it, there will be “nowhere to go”.

The whole of society will have become a single office and a single factory, with equality of labour and pay.

But this “factory” discipline, which the proletariat, after defeating the capitalists, after overthrowing the exploiters, will extend to the whole of society, is by no means our ideal, or our ultimate goal. It is only a necessary *step* for thoroughly cleansing society of all the infamies and abominations of capitalist exploitation *and for further progress*.

From the moment all members of society, or at least the vast majority, have learned to administer the state *themselves*,

* When the more important functions of the state are reduced to such accounting and control by the workers themselves, it will cease to be a “political state” and “public functions will lose their political character and become mere administrative functions” (cf. above, Chapter IV, 2, Engels’s controversy with the anarchists).—*Note by Lenin.*

have taken this work into their own hands, have organised control over the insignificant capitalist minority, over the gentry who wish to preserve their capitalist habits and over the workers who have been thoroughly corrupted by capitalism—from this moment the need for government of any kind begins to disappear altogether. The more complete the democracy, the nearer the moment when it becomes unnecessary. The more democratic the “state” which consists of the armed workers, and which is “no longer a state in the proper sense of the word”, the more rapidly *every form* of state begins to wither away.

For when *all* have learned to administer and actually do independently administer social production, independently keep accounts and exercise control over the parasites, the sons of the wealthy, the swindlers and other “guardians of capitalist traditions”, the escape from this popular accounting and control will inevitably become so incredibly difficult, such a rare exception, and will probably be accompanied by such swift and severe punishment (for the armed workers are practical men and not sentimental intellectuals, and they will scarcely allow anyone to trifle with them), that the *necessity* of observing the simple, fundamental rules of the community will very soon become a *habit*.

Then the door will be thrown wide open for the transition from the first phase of communist society to its higher phase, and with it to the complete withering away of the state.

V. I. Lenin

WHAT IS SOVIET POWER?

In 1919, Lenin's speech *What Is Soviet Power?* was recorded on a phonograph. In it, he explained the essence of the new state power established as a result of the victorious Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia. Lenin noted that Soviet government is directly opposite to all exploiter states, primarily to the bourgeois state. It signifies real sovereignty of the people: the state is ruled by workers and toiling peasants, who use their power to improve their living conditions and to build socialism and communism.

Significantly, the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, the highest body of state power, comprises workers, peasants and professionals, both men and women. All the deputies work in various state and socio-economic areas.

In his speech, Lenin expressed his firm conviction that true democracy championing the interests of the people would eventually win in all countries. This scientific prevision has come true in the socialist countries, where the same new type of socialist state has come to be established in some form or other.

What is Soviet power? What is the essence of this new power, which people in most countries still will not, or cannot, understand? The nature of this power, which is attracting larger and larger numbers of workers in every country, is the following: in the past the country was, in one way or another, governed by the rich, or by the capitalists, but now, for the first time, the country is being governed by the classes, and moreover, by the masses of those classes, which capitalism formerly oppressed. Even in the most democratic and freest republics, as long as capital rules and the land remains private property, the government will always be in the hands of a small minority, nine-tenths of which consist of capitalists, or rich men.

In this country, in Russia, for the first time in the world history, the government of the country is so organised that only the workers and the working peasants, to the exclusion of the exploiters, constitute those mass organisations known as Soviets, and these Soviets wield all state power. That is why, in spite of the slander that the representatives of the bourgeoisie in all countries spread about Russia, the word "Soviet" has now become not only intelligible but popular all over the world, has become the favourite word of the workers, and of all working people. And that is why, notwithstanding all the persecution to which the adherents of communism in the different countries are subjected, Soviet power must necessarily, inevitably, and in the not distant future, triumph all over the world.

We know very well that there are still many defects in the organisation of Soviet power in this country. Soviet power is not a miracle-working talisman. It does not, overnight, heal all the evils of the past—illiteracy, lack of culture, the consequences of a barbarous war, the aftermath of predatory capitalism. But it does pave the way to socialism. It gives those who were formerly oppressed the chance to straighten

their backs and to an ever-increasing degree to take the whole government of the country, the whole administration of the economy, the whole management of production, into their own hands.

Soviet power is the road to socialism that was discovered by the masses of the working people, and that is why it is the true road, that is why it is invincible.

V. I. Lenin

THE WORKING CLASS AND THE NATIONAL QUESTION

Lenin wrote this article in 1913,⁵ four years before the socialist revolution in Russia. At that time the country was ruled by a Russian tsar, but the population consisted of about 100 nations and nationalities, most of whom were oppressed by Russian landlords and capitalists. In these conditions, Lenin resolved the question concerning the unity of the revolutionary struggle of the working class and the national liberation struggle of oppressed peoples within such multinational country as Russia; this was, in effect, a major issue in the theory and practice of scientific communism.

Lenin explained that Russia's working class wants to eliminate all kinds of oppression of one nation by another, something that cannot be achieved if the working people of every nation would struggle for that separately from the working people of other nations. To win singlehanded would be impossible, since the oppressors, viz. the feudal lords and the bourgeoisie of all countries, are united in jointly exploiting the workers of all nations.

Lenin showed the real way to national emancipation. He said the working people of all nations must form a united front to concertedly oppose their common oppressors. Only then would it be possible to eliminate once and for all every kind of enslavement of man by man, and to gain true freedom for all nations.

In the 1917 Great October Socialist Revolution, the working people of all Russia's nations and nationalities took the road indicated by Lenin. The revolution and the subsequent construction of socialism in Russia eliminated national strife and all racial and national inequality and oppression. Under socialism, the previously backward peoples ascended to the heights of civilisation within a brief historical period. Today, all Soviet nations and nationalities enjoy legal and actual equality, and conditions have been created for their all-round prosperity.

Russia is a motley country as far as her nationalities are concerned. Government policy, which is the policy of the landowners supported by the bourgeoisie, is steeped in Black-Hundred nationalism.

This policy is spearheaded against the *majority* of the peoples of Russia who constitute the *majority* of her population. And alongside this we have the bourgeois nationalism of other nations (Polish, Jewish, Ukrainian, Georgian, etc.), raising its head and trying to *divert* the working class from its great world-wide tasks by a national struggle or a struggle for national culture.

The national question must be clearly considered and solved by all class-conscious workers.

When the bourgeoisie was fighting for freedom together with the people, together with all those who labour, it stood for full freedom and equal rights for the nations. Advanced countries, Switzerland, Belgium, Norway and others, provide us with an example of how free nations under a really democratic system live together in peace or separate peacefully from each other.

Today the bourgeoisie fears the workers and is seeking an alliance with the Purishkeviches, with the reactionaries, and is betraying democracy, advocating oppression or unequal rights among nations and corrupting the workers with *nationalist* slogans.

In our times the proletariat alone upholds the real freedom of nations and the unity of workers of all nations.

For different nations to live together in peace and freedom or to separate and form different states (if that is more convenient for them), a full democracy, upheld by the working class, is essential. No privileges for any nation or any one language! Not even the slightest degree of oppression or the slightest injustice in respect of a national minority—such are the principles of working-class democracy. The capitalists and landowners want, at all costs, to keep the workers of different nations apart while the powers that be live splendidly together as shareholders in profitable concerns involving millions (such as the Lena Goldfields); Orthodox Christians and Jews, Russians and Germans, Poles and Ukrainians, everyone who possesses *capital*, exploit the workers of all nations in company.

Class-conscious workers stand for *full unity* among the workers of all nations in every educational, trade union, political, etc., workers' organisation. Let the Cadet gentlemen disgrace themselves by denying or belittling the importance of equal rights for Ukrainians. Let the bourgeoisie of all nations find comfort in lying phrases about national culture, national tasks, etc., etc.

The workers will not allow themselves to be disunited by sugary speeches about national culture, or "national-cultural autonomy". The workers of all nations together, concertedly, uphold full freedom and complete equality of rights in organisations common to all—and that is the guarantee of genuine culture.

The workers of the whole world are building up their own internationalist culture, which the champions of freedom and the enemies of oppression have for long been preparing. To the old world, the world of national oppression, national bickering, and national isolation the workers counterpose a new world, a world of the unity of the working people of all nations, a world in which there is no place for any privileges or for the slightest degree of oppression of man by man.

V. I. Lenin

THE AWAKENING OF ASIA

Lenin wrote this article in 1913. It examines a major issue in the theory and practice of scientific communism, namely that of the unity and interaction of the revolutionary workers' and national liberation movements.

The article elucidates the sources and consequences of the revolutionary-democratic movement which started in the early 20th century in some Asian countries and had its intrinsic causes. The capitalism that had developed in colonial and semi-colonial countries resulted in the formation there of a working class and local intelligentsia who headed the resolute struggle of the popular masses against the colonial yoke.

Lenin revealed in a most detailed way the international significance of the revolutionary-democratic movement in colonial countries. He noted its inseparable connection with the struggle of the working class in developed countries against the capitalist system. The revolution of 1905-1907 in Russia, which was aimed against reactionary Russian tsarism and at democratic and socialist renovation of society, gave an impetus to democratic revolutions in Asian countries.

Lenin believed that a national liberation movement fighting imperialism weakens the latter and thereby makes it easier for the workers of the more developed countries to overthrow the exploiter capitalist system. At the same time, the revolutionary struggle of the workers in capitalist countries facilitates the success of the national liberation struggle of oppressed nations. Lenin emphasised that this was instrumental in opening a new phase in world history, in which the peoples of colonies and semi-colonies began to take active part in the world liberation movement in the wake of revolutionary actions by Russia's proletariat.

Was it so long ago that China was considered typical of the lands that had been standing still for centuries? Today China is a land of seething political activity, the scene of a virile social movement and of a democratic upsurge. Following the 1905 movement in Russia, the democratic revolution spread to the whole of Asia—to Turkey, Persia, China. Ferment is growing in British India.

A significant development is the spread of the revolutionary democratic movement to the Dutch East Indies, to Java and the other Dutch colonies, with a population of some forty million.

First, the democratic movement is developing among the masses of Java, where a nationalist movement has arisen under the banner of Islam. Secondly, capitalism has created a local intelligentsia consisting of acclimatised Europeans who demand independence for the Dutch East Indies. Thirdly, the fairly large Chinese population of Java and the other islands have brought the revolutionary movement from their native land.

Describing this awakening of the Dutch East Indies, van Ravesteyn, a Dutch Marxist, points out that the age-old despotism and tyranny of the Dutch Government now meet with resolute resistance and protest from the masses of the native population.

The usual events of a pre-revolutionary period have begun. Parties and unions are being founded at amazing speed. The government is banning them, thereby only fanning the resentment and accelerating the growth of the movement. Recently, for example, it dissolved the "Indian Party" because its programme and rules spoke of the striving for *independence*. The Dutch *Derzhimordas* (with the approval, incidentally, of the clericals and liberals—European liberalism is rotten to the core!) regarded this clause as a criminal attempt

at separation from the Netherlands! The dissolved party was, of course, revived under a different name.

A National Union of the native population has been formed in Java. It already has a membership of 80,000 and is holding mass meetings. There is no stopping the growth of the democratic movement.

World capitalism and the 1905 movement in Russia have finally aroused Asia. Hundreds of millions of the downtrodden and benighted have awakened from medieval stagnation to a new life and are rising to fight for elementary human rights and democracy.

The workers of the advanced countries follow with interest and inspiration this powerful growth of the liberation movement, in all its various forms, in every part of the world. The bourgeoisie of Europe, scared by the might of the working-class movement, is embracing reaction, militarism, clericalism and obscurantism. But the proletariat of the European countries and the young democracy of Asia, fully confident of its strength and with abiding faith in the masses, are advancing to take the place of this decadent and moribund bourgeoisie.

The awakening of Asia and the beginning of the struggle for power by the advanced proletariat of Europe are a symbol of the new phase in world history that began early this century.

**From: "ON THE CENTENARY
OF THE BIRTH OF V. I. LENIN", THESES OF THE
CENTRAL COMMITTEE,
COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION**

In the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union published its Theses "To the Centenary of the Birth of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin". It read in part that April 22, marked one hundred years since the birth of Lenin, brilliant continuer of Marx's and Engels' revolutionary teaching, creator of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, organiser of the greatest social revolution of all times, founder of the world's first socialist state, and leader of the international working class and of all the working people.

The Theses emphasise that a whole revolutionary era in the life of mankind is connected with V. I. Lenin. Following Marx and Engels, the brilliant founders of scientific communism, V. I. Lenin answered the most vital questions posed by historical development, comprehensively elaborated the theory of socialist revolution and construction of communist society; armed Russia's and international revolutionary movements with a scientifically-grounded strategy and tactics; and headed the working class' struggle for implementing the ideals of socialism. As a result, socialism, which Marx and Engels had turned from an utopia into a science, and which V. I. Lenin had enriched with new conclusions and discoveries, became a social practice of world-wide historical significance to turn into the main revolutionary force of our time.

Cited below are Sections 2, 3 and 4 from the above-said Theses. They expound V. I. Lenin's teaching on the revolutionary party of the working class, and on its strategy and tactics. They also reveal the experience gained by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, a party founded by V. I. Lenin, in preparing and accomplishing the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia.

2

Lenin believed that the formation and strengthening of a revolutionary working-class party was the decisive condition for the success of a socialist revolution. He saw in a proletarian party a mighty lever capable of "overturning Russia".

The building of the Party was preceded by tremendous ideological and theoretical work by Lenin, his criticism of petty-bourgeois Narodnik socialism and uncompromising struggle against reformist and other opportunist trends. Had not the ground been cleared in this way, it would have been impossible for Marxism to be linked with the movement for emancipation and to establish the independent class line of the proletariat.

The founding of the Party of Bolsheviks, a party of a new type, signified the victory of the Marxist, truly revolutionary trend in the working-class movement in Russia. For the first time in the history of the international socialist movement the programme of a working-class party called for the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the need of which for building a new society had been theoretically demonstrated by Marx and Engels and then thoroughly substantiated by Lenin. The Party led the struggle of the Russian proletariat, of the revolutionary masses, against the tsarist autocracy and capitalism.

Summing up the vast experience of the revolutionary movement, Lenin, in his "What is to Be Done?", "One Step Forward, Two Steps Back" and other works, elaborated an integral teaching on the proletarian party of a new type.

Lenin conceived the party as the vanguard of the proletariat, its organized detachment, the highest form of political organization, called upon to help the working class assert itself, to realize and fulfil its world historic mission. Lenin stressed that there could be no revolutionary movement

without a revolutionary theory, that only a party equipped with an advanced theory could perform a vanguard role.

Lenin and the Bolsheviks repulsed all attempts to turn the Party into a discussion club, a conglomeration of factions and groupings. Lenin and the Bolsheviks saw the decisive condition for the strength of the Party in monolithic cohesion of its ranks, in the inadmissibility of activities aimed at undermining its unity and weakening its iron discipline.

The Bolshevik Party emerged, grew and developed as a party of true proletarian internationalists. It is profoundly internationalist in its ideology, structure and the nature of its activity. Uniting in its ranks the proletariat of a multinational country, the Bolshevik Party, was, from the moment of its foundation, an inalienable component of a single whole, a militant contingent of the international Communist movement.

The most complicated tasks which the Bolsheviks, led by Lenin, had to carry out were to elaborate and perfect the means and methods of the working-class struggle, to arm the Party with revolutionary strategy and tactics. Lenin worked persistently to organize a militant proletarian party. He resolutely exposed the opportunist practices of the parties of the 2nd International, which were gradually turning into parties of social reform and becoming part of the political system of bourgeois society, limiting their activity to legal, mostly parliamentary, methods. The Bolsheviks set an example of skilful combination of legal and illegal, parliamentary and non-parliamentary, peaceful and non-peaceful methods of struggle, and used them flexibly, depending on the situation. The Bolsheviks did not renounce struggle for reforms but they always subordinated this struggle, just as their entire activity, to the preparation of the revolution.

Lenin considered struggle on two fronts—against the Right and “Left” varieties of opportunism and revisionism—an indispensable condition for the successful activity of a Marxist Party, for the development and success of the working-class movement.

Throughout his revolutionary activity Lenin was a relentless fighter against trends that used the flag of Marxism as a cover for their hostility to scientific socialism. He subjected the bourgeois-liberal nature of the reformism of the “legal Marxists” and “economists” to thorough criticism. Upholding

and defending the revolutionary principles of Marxism, the Party and Lenin waged an uncompromising struggle against Menshevism, the most dangerous opportunist trend inside the Russian working-class movement, and sharply criticized the opportunism of the Right-wing socialist leaders in the international arena. At the same time, Lenin resolutely rejected the petty-bourgeois "ultra-revolutionariness" which ignored the real conditions of class struggle, impelled the proletariat towards political gambles, and doomed the working-class movement to defeat.

The establishment of the Bolshevik Party marked the beginning of a new stage in the Russian and international working-class movement. For the first time, the proletariat received an organization capable of successfully guiding its struggle for social emancipation in the new historical conditions.

3

The period when capitalism entered its imperialist stage and the proletarian movement acquired a mass scale called for further development of Marxist theory, for the working out of revolutionary strategy and tactics which would accord with the new historical conditions.

Comparing the Russian economic setup with the trends of world capitalism, Lenin, in his fundamental work "The Development of Capitalism in Russia", showed the increasing aggravation of socio-economic antagonisms in town and country, thoroughly analyzed the changes in the class structure of society and showed who were the real allies of the proletariat in bourgeois-democratic and socialist revolutions. He convincingly demonstrated that the peasantry was destined to play a role of utmost importance in the revolutionary struggle, together with the chief motive force of the revolution—the working class.

Lenin showed that by virtue of its social position and its struggle to abolish the landlord ownership of the land, the toiling peasantry was objectively interested not only in the bourgeois-democratic revolution but in the overthrow of the power of capital as well, for only socialism could bring a radical solution of the agrarian problem. Lenin studied the

main trends of world agrarian capitalist evolution and the process of the class stratification in the countryside; he determined the attitude of the working class to various sections of the peasantry at different stages of the revolution and created an integral theory and programme on the agrarian question.

In the book "Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution" and in his other works Lenin, on the basis of analysis of the experience of the Russian revolution of 1905 and the European working-class movement, proved that from now on the hegemony in the struggle for emancipation was passing to the proletariat and that the hegemony of the proletariat in the bourgeois-democratic revolution, in alliance with all the peasantry, would inevitably grow over into the hegemony of the proletariat in the socialist revolution in alliance with the rural poor and all the exploited masses of town and country. "From the democratic revolution we shall at once ... begin to pass to the Socialist Revolution. We stand for uninterrupted revolution," Lenin wrote. "We shall not stop half-way."^{*}

This conclusion blasted the traditional Social-Democratic dogma according to which a long period of capitalism was to follow the bourgeois revolution. Lenin showed that in the epoch of imperialism the solution of democratic tasks and the solution of socialist tasks converged, and that in these conditions the policy of alliance of the proletariat with the middle sections of the population in the struggle for democracy and socialism acquired particular importance. The development of revolutionary events in Russia and in other countries corroborated Lenin's prediction.

A historic contribution of Lenin's was the creation of a scientific theory of imperialism, his study of its nature, contradictions and laws. Lenin's analysis of imperialism in "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism" and in other works is a direct continuation and further development of the ideas of Marx's "Capital". Lenin proved that the monopoly stage of capitalism is its final stage, the eve of the socialist revolution. The comprehensive analysis of the new stage in world history made it possible for Lenin to determine the

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 9, p. 237.

tremendous possibilities of the revolutionary movement in the epoch of imperialism.

Having disclosed the law of the uneven economic and political development of capitalism at its imperialist stage, Lenin arrived at the conclusion that different countries would come to socialism at different times and that the imperialist front may be breached not necessarily in the country with the highest level of development. That conclusion was a new word in the science of Marxism. It radically changed the old conception of the conditions for the victory of the new system and opened a clear prospect of struggle to the Russian and international proletariat. Already then, Lenin foresaw the course of the main processes of social development as a result of the victory of socialism in one or several countries; foresaw the inevitability of struggle between the two systems in the world arena.

Lenin thoroughly elaborated the nationalities problem in the light of the new historical conditions: he advanced and substantiated the idea of joining the proletarian class struggle with the struggle for the abolition of national oppression, joining the struggle for socialism with the anti-imperialist liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples.

The necessity of comprehending the new historical processes and advancing the Marxist method, as well as the tasks of ideological struggle, called for an exhaustive analysis by the Bolshevik Party and its leader of the current philosophical problems. Lenin's works "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism", "Philosophical Notebooks", and others developed and enriched the ideas contained in the works of Marx and Engels on dialectical and historical materialism. Lenin "sorted out" philosophically new scientific problems that had amassed after Marx and Engels, defended and developed the basic principles of the world outlook and method of Marxism, and criticized in great detail idealistic and metaphysical concepts.

Lenin's further elaboration of materialistic dialectics, his study of the dialectical materialist theory of knowledge and his idea of the union of natural science with philosophy are of everlasting importance. Lenin was the first thinker of our century who saw in the achievements of natural science of his time the beginning of a tremendous scientific revolution, who was able to disclose and generalize philosophically the

revolutionary meaning of the fundamental discoveries made by the great explorers of nature. He gave a brilliant philosophical interpretation of new scientific data in the period of the drastic "breaking of principles" in the leading fields of natural science. His idea of the inexhaustibility of matter has become the general principle of natural science.

Lenin comprehensively studied the dialectics of social development, the interaction of economics and politics, the interconnection of social being and social consciousness, and many other questions. The elaboration of the problems of social development by Lenin was closely connected with the requirements of revolutionary practice and ideological struggle. Lenin's criticism of subjectivism in philosophy and sociology dealt a crucial blow at the ideological sources of political voluntarism and adventurism. His criticism of the concepts of fatalism and spontaneity as the theoretical basis of the tactics of Right-wing opportunism were of fundamental importance.

Pointing out the determinative significance of the objective conditions and trends of social development, Lenin always combined depth of scientific analysis of historical circumstances with the most resolute recognition of the revolutionary energy, initiative, class-consciousness and organization of the masses, classes and parties, as well as the significance of the activity of individuals. His dialectical mind revealed new possibilities for expediting the revolutionary process in the operation of the subjective factor in conditions when general prerequisites for replacing capitalism by socialism are already ripe.

Lenin teaches us that in such a situation the working people's readiness and ability to take revolutionary action, their class-consciousness, organization and experience in struggle become decisive for the success of the revolution.

4

The revolutionary-transformative role of the Marxist-Leninist theory and its unity with revolutionary practice in the activity of the Bolshevik Party headed by Lenin were strikingly manifested in the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

The Revolution of February 1917 overthrew the tsarist autocracy and resulted in the establishment of the power of the bourgeoisie. The working class was now faced with the task of going over to a new stage of the struggle—the winning of political power, the struggle for socialism. Lenin equipped the Party and the working class with a concrete plan for the transition to a socialist revolution. In the April Theses, in the documents prepared for the April Conference and the 6th Party Congress, in his articles and statements Lenin advanced strategical and tactical slogans of tremendous mobilizing power. "The specific feature of the present situation in Russia," he pointed out, "is that the country is *passing* from the first stage of the revolution—which, owing to the insufficient class-consciousness and organization of the proletariat, placed power in the hands of the bourgeoisie—to its second stage, which must place power in the hands of the proletariat and the poorest sections of the peasants."*

The Bolsheviks advanced towards the socialist revolution with a clear-cut programme of preventing the national disaster to the brink of which the country had been brought by the criminal policy of tsarism and the exploiting classes. The Bolsheviks came out as a party not only of the destroyers of the old but also of the builders of a new society. "The State and Revolution," "The Impending Catastrophe and How to Combat It," "Can the Bolsheviks Retain State Power?" and other Lenin's works of that period became for the Party an effective programme of socio-political and economic reconstruction.

Clarity of programme and consistency of its implementation enabled the Bolsheviks to free a considerable part of the Mensheviks' and Socialist Revolutionaries' followers from the influence of these conciliating parties, to win the majority of the working people to their own side and to build up a political army of the socialist revolution. The struggle of the working class for socialism, the nation-wide movement for peace, the peasants' struggle for land and the national-liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples of Russia merged into a single stream.

In the period between February and October 1917, the

* V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 24, p. 22.

Bolshevik Party with Lenin at the head set an example in the use of various forms and methods of class struggle, their able combination and change and the choice of the most effective of them at each given moment. By his comprehensive elaboration of the teaching of the revolutionary situation and armed uprising Lenin made an outstanding contribution to Marxist theory.

The Party led the masses to the storming of capitalism precisely when the necessary objective and subjective conditions had arisen, when the nation-wide crisis had matured and when the mind, the will and the emotions of tens of millions of people had already been prepared for the storm by the entire course of the struggle. Guided by Lenin, the Bolshevik Party put into practice the Marxist precept that uprising must be regarded as an art.

The Great October Socialist Revolution gave the world an example of how to solve fundamental social problems: the overthrow of the power of the exploiters and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the turning of the private property of the bourgeoisie and landlords into public socialist property, the just solution of the agrarian problem in the peasants' favour, the liberation of the dependent peoples from colonial and national oppression, and the creation of the political and economic prerequisites for the building of socialism.

The Great October Socialist Revolution was the first victorious act of the world socialist revolution. It changed radically the political and socio-economic aspect of one of the biggest powers, elevated the international liberation movement to a higher plane, "charted the road to socialism for the whole world," as Lenin wrote, "and has shown the bourgeoisie that their triumph is coming to an end".* A new chapter began in world history.

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, p. 44.

**From: "TASKS AT THE PRESENT STAGE
OF THE STRUGGLE AGAINST IMPERIALISM
AND UNITED ACTION OF THE COMMUNIST
AND WORKERS' PARTIES
AND ALL ANTI-IMPERIALIST FORCES",
A DOCUMENT ADOPTED ON JUNE 17,
BY THE INTERNATIONAL MEETING OF COMMUNIST
AND WORKERS' PARTIES IN MOSCOW**

An International Meeting of representatives from 75 Communist and Workers' Parties was held from June 5 through June 17, in Moscow, the capital of the USSR. The above-adopted document proved to be the platform designed to unite all the revolutionary forces of our time. The call for unity of the communist and revolutionary movement in the struggle against imperialism sounded world-wide. This unity was important in strengthening the movement for détente and for the further development of the entire world revolutionary process.

Cited below are slightly abridged versions of Parts I and IV from the above-said document. Part I shows the course of the main events in the non-socialist world in the sixties and draws major theoretical conclusions regarding the revolutionary struggle against imperialism. Particular attention is given to the struggle for national and social liberation of the peoples of former colonial and dependent countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

Part IV comprehensively substantiates the need for consolidation of Communist and Workers' Parties and shows the required essence of that unity and of joint anti-imperialist actions. The Document underlines that the unity of the communist movement rests on loyalty to Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism (international solidarity of workers, of all working people), and on whole-hearted and faithful service to the interests of one's own people and to the common cause of socialism.

The International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties played an important role in consolidating the communist movement and in intensifying the peoples' struggle against imperialism.

The Meeting of representatives of 'Communist and Workers' Parties took place in Moscow at a very important juncture in world development. Powerful revolutionary processes are gathering momentum throughout the world. Three mighty forces of our time—the world socialist system, the international working class and the national liberation movement—are coming together in the struggle against imperialism. The present phase is characterised by growing possibilities for a further advance of the revolutionary and progressive forces. At the same time, the dangers brought about by imperialism, by its policy of aggression, are growing. Imperialism, whose general crisis is deepening, continues to oppress many peoples and remains a constant threat to peace and social progress.

The existing situation demands united action of Communists and all other anti-imperialist forces so that maximum use may be made of the mounting possibilities for a broader offensive against imperialism, against the forces of reaction and war.

The Meeting discussed urgent tasks of the struggle against imperialism and problems of united action by Communists and all other anti-imperialist forces. As a result of the discussion, held in a spirit of democracy, equality and internationalism, the participants in the Meeting reached common conclusions concerning the present world situation and the tasks arising from it.

I.

Mankind has entered the last third of our century in a situation marked by a sharpening of the historic struggle between the forces of progress and reaction, between socialism and imperialism. This clash is world-wide and embraces all the basic spheres of social life: economy, politics, ideology and culture.

The world revolutionary movement continues its offensive despite the difficulties and setbacks of some of its contingents. Notwithstanding the counter-offensives launched by it, imperialism has failed to change the general relationship of forces in its favour. It has been possible to prevent the outbreak of a world war thanks to the growing economic, political and military might, and the peace-loving foreign policy of the Soviet Union and other socialist states; to the actions of the international proletariat and of all fighters against imperialism; to the struggle for national liberation; and also to the massive peace movement. Socialism, which has triumphed on one-third of the globe, has scored new successes in the world-wide struggle for the hearts and minds of the people. The events of the past decade bear out that the Marxist-Leninist assessment of the character, content and chief trends of the present epoch is correct. Ours is an epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism.

At present there are real possibilities for resolving key problems of our time in the interests of peace, democracy and socialism, to deal imperialism new blows. However, while the world system of imperialism has not grown stronger, it remains a serious and dangerous foe. The United States of America, the chief imperialist power, has grown more aggressive.

The core of the aggressive policy of imperialism is the drive to use all means to weaken the positions of socialism, suppress the national liberation movement, hamstring the struggle of the working people in the capitalist countries and halt the irreversible decline of capitalism.

Global in scale, the basic contradiction between imperialism and socialism is growing deeper. Under conditions where the struggle between the two world systems is becoming sharper, the capitalist powers seek, despite the growing contradictions dividing them, to unite their efforts to uphold and strengthen the system of exploitation and oppression and regain the positions they have lost. US imperialism strives to retain its influence over other capitalist countries and pursue a common policy with them in the main spheres of the class struggle.

The spearhead of the aggressive strategy of imperialism continues to be aimed first and foremost against the socialist countries. Imperialism does not forego open armed struggle

against socialism. It ceaselessly intensifies the arms race and tries to activate the military blocs organised for aggression against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. It steps up its ideological fight against them and tries to hamper the economic development of the socialist countries.

In its actions against the working-class movement imperialism violates democratic rights and freedoms and uses naked violence, brutal methods of police persecution and anti-labour legislation. Moreover, it has recourse to demagogic, bourgeois reformism and opportunist ideology and policy, and is constantly in quest of new methods to undermine the working-class movement from within and "integrate" it into the capitalist system.

In its struggle against the national liberation movement, imperialism stubbornly defends the remnants of the colonial system, on the one hand, and, on the other, uses methods of neo-colonialism in an effort to prevent the economic and social advance of developing states, of countries which have won national sovereignty. To this end it supports reactionary circles, retards the abolition of the most backward social structures and tries to obstruct progress along the road to socialism or along the road of progressive non-capitalist development, which can open the way to socialism. The imperialists impose on these countries economic agreements and military-political pacts which infringe on their sovereignty; they exploit them through the export of capital, unequal terms of trade; the manipulation of prices, exchange rates, loans and various forms of so-called aid; and pressure by international financial organisations.

The gulf between the highly developed capitalist states and the majority of the other countries of the capitalist world is growing wider; hunger is an acute problem in a number of the latter. Imperialism provokes friction in developing countries and sows division between them by encouraging reactionary nationalism. Through anti-communism it tries to split the ranks of the revolutionaries in these countries and isolate them from their best friends—the socialist states and the revolutionary working-class movement in the capitalist countries.

Through military-political blocs, military bases in foreign countries, economic pressure and trade blockades imperialism

maintains tension in some areas of the world. It provides reactionary organisations with financial and political support and intensifies political oppression. It resorts to armed intervention, savage repression—especially in countries where the struggle acquires the most acute forms and where the revolutionary forces fight arms in hand—counter-revolutionary conspiracies, reactionary and fascist coups, provocations and blackmail.

In face of the strengthening of the international positions of socialism, imperialism tries to weaken the unity of the world socialist system. It uses the differences in the international revolutionary movement in an effort to split its ranks. It places its ideological apparatus, including mass media, in the service of anti-communism and its struggle against socialism, against all progressive forces.

In these past years, imperialism has time and again provoked sharp international crises which have pushed humanity to the brink of a thermonuclear conflict. However, US imperialism has to take into account the relationship of forces in the world, the nuclear potential of the Soviet Union and the possible consequences of a missile-nuclear war, and it is becoming more and more difficult and dangerous for it to gamble on another world war. Therefore the ruling circles of the United States, without abandoning preparations for such a war, lay emphasis on local wars.

However, the contradiction between the imperialist “policy of strength” and the real possibilities of imperialism is becoming ever more evident. *Imperialism can neither regain its lost historical initiative nor reverse world development. The main direction of mankind's development is determined by the world socialist system, the international working class, all revolutionary forces...*

Present-day imperialism, which is trying to adapt itself to the conditions of the struggle between the two systems and to the demands of the scientific and technological revolution, has some new features. Its state-monopoly character is becoming more pronounced. It resorts ever more extensively to such instruments as state-stimulated monopolistic concentration of production and capital, redistribution by the state of an increasing proportion of the national income, allocation of war contracts to the monopolies, government financing of industri-

al development and research programmes, the drawing up of economic development programmes on a country-wide scale, the policy of imperialist integration and new forms of capital export.

However, state-monopoly regulation, exercised in forms and on a scale which meet the interests of monopoly capital and are aimed at preserving its rule, is unable to control the spontaneous forces of the capitalist market. Practically no capitalist state has been able to avoid considerable cyclical fluctuations and slumps in its economy; in some countries, periods of rapid industrial growth alternate with periods in which there is a slowdown and often a drop in production. The capitalist system is in the grip of an acute monetary and financial crisis.

The scientific and technological revolution offers mankind unprecedented possibilities to remake Nature, to produce immense material wealth and to multiply man's creative capabilities. These possibilities should serve the general welfare, but capitalism is using the scientific and technological revolution to increase its profits and intensify the exploitation of the working people.

The scientific and technological revolution accelerates the socialisation of the economy; under monopoly domination this leads to the reproduction of social antagonisms on a growing scale and in a sharper form. Not only have the long-standing contradictions of capitalism been aggravated, but new ones have arisen as well. This applies, in particular, to the contradiction between the unlimited possibilities opened up by the scientific and technological revolution and the roadblocks raised by capitalism to their utilisation for the benefit of society as a whole. Capitalism squanders national wealth, allocating for war purposes a great proportion of scientific discoveries and immense material resources. This is the contradiction between the social character of present-day production and the state-monopoly nature of its regulation. This is not only the growth of the contradiction between capital and labour, but also the deepening of the antagonism between the interests of the overwhelming majority of the nation and those of the financial oligarchy.

Even in the most developed capitalist countries, millions of people suffer the torments of unemployment, want and

insecurity. Contrary to assertions about the "revolution in incomes" and "social partnership", capitalist exploitation is in fact increasing. The rise in wages lags far behind the growth rates of labour productivity and the intensification of labour, behind the social needs and even more so behind the growth of monopoly profits. The position of the small farmers continues to deteriorate and the living conditions of a considerable part of the middle strata are becoming more difficult.

The instability of the capitalist system has increased. Socio-political crises are breaking out in many countries, in the course of which the working masses are becoming aware of the necessity of deep-going and decisive changes...

Everywhere the monopoly bourgeoisie tries to create the illusion that everything the working people aspire to can be achieved without a revolutionary transformation of the existing system. To conceal its exploiting and aggressive nature, capitalism resorts to theoretical whitewash ("people's capitalism", the "welfare state", the "affluent society", etc.). The revolutionary working-class movement exposes these concepts and wages a determined struggle against them. It thus deepens the crisis of imperialist ideology; increasing numbers of people are turning away from this ideology.

The conscience and intellect of mankind cannot be reconciled with the crimes of imperialism. Imperialism bears the guilt for two world wars which snuffed out the lives of tens of millions of people. It has created a gigantic military machine which devours tremendous human and material resources. Intensifying the armaments race, it plans the production of new weapons for decades ahead. It is fraught with the threat of a thermonuclear world war which would annihilate hundreds of millions of people and turn entire countries into deserts.

Imperialism gave birth to fascism—the system of political terror and death camps. Wherever it can, imperialism wages an offensive against democratic rights and liberties; it tramples underfoot human dignity and cultivates racialism.

Imperialism is responsible for the hardship and suffering of hundreds of millions of people. It is chiefly to blame for the fact that vast masses of people in Asian, African and Latin American countries are compelled to live in conditions of

poverty, disease and illiteracy and under archaic social relations, and that entire nationalities are doomed to extinction.

The course of social development shows that imperialism comes into conflict with the vital interests of workers by hand and by brain, of different social strata, peoples and nations. As a result, growing masses of working people, social movements and entire peoples are rising against imperialism.

The working class, the democratic and revolutionary forces, the peoples must unite and act jointly in order to put an end to imperialism's criminal actions which can bring still graver suffering to mankind. To curb the aggressors and liberate mankind from imperialism is the mission of the working class, of all the anti-imperialist forces fighting for peace, democracy, national independence and socialism.

IV.

The participants in the Meeting consider that the most important prerequisite for increasing the Communist and Workers' Parties' contribution to the solution of the problems facing the peoples is to raise the unity of the communist movement to a higher level in conformity with present-day requirements. This demands determined and persistent effort by all the Parties. *The cohesion of the Communist and Workers' Parties is the most important factor in rallying together all the anti-imperialist forces.*

The participants in the Meeting reaffirm their common view that relations between the fraternal Parties are based on the principles of proletarian internationalism, solidarity, and mutual support, respect for independence and equality, and non-interference in each other's internal affairs. Strict adherence to these principles is an indispensable condition for developing comradely co-operation between the fraternal Parties and strengthening the unity of the communist movement. Bilateral consultations, regional meetings and international conferences are natural forms of such co-operation and are conducted on the basis of the principles accepted in the communist movement. These principles and these forms give the Communist and Workers' Parties every possibility to unite

their efforts in the struggle for their common aims, under conditions of the growing diversity of the world revolutionary process. All Parties have equal rights. As there is no leading centre of the international communist movement, voluntary co-ordination of the actions of Parties in order effectively to carry out the tasks before them acquires increased importance.

United action by Communist and Workers' Parties will promote cohesion of the communist movement on Marxist-Leninist principles. Joint actions aimed at solving vital practical problems of the revolutionary and general democratic movements of our time promote a necessary exchange of experience between the various contingents of the communist movement. They help to enrich and creatively develop Marxist-Leninist theory, to strengthen internationalist revolutionary positions on urgent political problems.

The participants in the Meeting proclaim their Parties' firm resolve to do their utmost for the working people and for social progress, with a view to advancing towards complete victory over international capital. They regard joint action against imperialism and for general democratic demands as a component and a stage of the struggle for socialist revolution and the abolition of the system of exploitation of man by man.

The participants in the Meeting are convinced that the effectiveness of each Communist Party's policy depends on its successes in its own country, on the successes of other fraternal Parties and on the extent of their co-operation. Each Communist Party is responsible for its activity to its own working class and people and, at the same time, to the international working class. The national and international responsibilities of each Communist and Workers' Party are indivisible. Marxists-Leninists are both patriots and internationalists; they reject both national narrowmindedness and the negation or underestimation of national interests and the striving for hegemony. At the same time, the Communist Parties—the Parties of the working class and all working people—are the standardbearers of genuine national interests unlike the reactionary classes, which betray these interests. The winning of power by the working class and its allies is the greatest contribution which a Communist Party fighting under

capitalist conditions can make to the cause of socialism and proletarian internationalism.

The Communist and Workers' Parties are conducting their activity in diverse, specific conditions, requiring an appropriate approach to the solution of concrete problems. Each Party, guided by the principles of Marxism-Leninism and in keeping with concrete national conditions, fully independently elaborates its own policy, determines the directions, forms and methods of struggle, and, depending on the circumstances, chooses the peaceful or non-peaceful way of transition to socialism, and also the forms and methods of building socialism in its own country. At the same time, the diverse conditions in which the Communist Parties operate, the different approaches to practical tasks and even differences on certain questions must not hinder concerted international action by fraternal Parties, particularly on the basic problems of the anti-imperialist struggle. The greater the strength and the unity of each Communist Party, the better can it fulfil its role both inside the country and in the international communist movement.

Communists are aware that our movement, while scoring great historical victories in the course of its development, has recently encountered serious difficulties. Communists are convinced, however, that these difficulties will be overcome. This belief is based on the fact that the international working class has common long-term objectives and interests, on the striving of each Party to find a solution to existing problems which would meet both national and international interests and the Communists' revolutionary mission; it is based on the will of Communists for cohesion on an international scale.

The Communist and Workers' Parties, regardless of some difference of opinion, reaffirm their determination to present a united front in the struggle against imperialism.

Some of the divergences which have arisen are eliminated through an exchange of opinion or disappear as the development of events clarifies the essence of the outstanding issues. Other divergences may last long. The Meeting is confident that the outstanding issues can and must be resolved correctly by strengthening all forms of co-operation among the Communist Parties, by extending inter-Party ties, mutual exchange of experience, comradely discussion and consultation and

unity of action in the international arena. It is an internationalist duty of each Party to do everything it can to help improve relations and promote trust between all Parties and to undertake further efforts to strengthen the unity of the international communist movement. This unity is strengthened by a collective analysis of concrete reality.

The policy of joint anti-imperialist action demands that the ideological and political role of the Marxist-Leninist Parties in the world revolutionary process should be enhanced. Marching in the front ranks of the revolutionary, liberation and democratic movements, Communists will continue to fight uncompromisingly against bourgeois ideology and to explain to the working people the real meaning of their struggle and the conditions for victory. To wage a successful struggle against imperialism and to ensure the victory of their cause, Communists will propagate the ideas of scientific socialism in the working-class movement and among the broad masses, including young people; they will consistently uphold their principles and work for the triumph of Marxism-Leninism and, in accordance with the concrete situation, fight against Right- and Left-opportunist distortions of theory and policy, against revisionism, dogmatism and Left-sectarian adventurism. These deviations tend generally to underestimate the importance of the real forces which can and must be drawn into the struggle.

Loyalty to Marxism-Leninism and to proletarian internationalism, and dedicated and devoted service in the interests of their peoples and the common cause of socialism are a requisite for the efficacy and correct orientation of united action by the Communist and Workers' Parties, a guarantee that they will achieve their historic goals.

The communist movement is an integral part of modern society and is its most active force. Hence, the banning of Communist Parties is an attack on the democratic rights and vital interests of the peoples. The participants in the Meeting support all the Communist Parties of the world, without exception, which fight for their right of legal participation in the political life of their countries... We proclaim our solidarity with our fellow fighters in the common struggle who are lying in the jails of fascist and dictatorial regimes, in prisons in the capitalist countries, and we work for their release.

The participants regard this Meeting as an important stage in the cohesion of the world communist movement. They consider that the absence of certain Communist Parties should not hinder fraternal ties and co-operation between all Communist Parties without exception. They declare their resolve to achieve joint action in the struggle against imperialism, for the common objectives of the international working-class movement, as well as with the Communist and Workers' Parties not represented at the present Meeting.

The struggle against imperialism is a long, hard and strenuous fight. Tense class battles lie ahead and they cannot be avoided. Let us step up the offensive against imperialism and internal reaction. The revolutionary and progressive forces are certain to triumph.

Peoples of the socialist countries, workers, democratic forces in the capitalist countries, newly liberated peoples and those who are oppressed, unite in a common struggle against imperialism, for peace, national liberation, social progress, democracy and socialism!

**Extract from: THE FINAL DOCUMENT
"FOR PEACE, SECURITY, CO-OPERATION
AND SOCIAL PROGRESS IN EUROPE",
ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY
BY THE CONFERENCE OF EUROPEAN COMMUNIST
AND WORKERS' PARTIES IN BERLIN**

A conference of twenty-nine European Communist and Workers' Parties took place on June 29 and 30, in Berlin, capital of the German Democratic Republic. It unanimously adopted the final document entitled "For Peace, Security, Co-operation, and Social Progress in Europe", whose basic tenets are cited below. The document expresses the resolve of the participants in the Conference to wage a consistent struggle to achieve the goals of peace, democracy and social progress. This meets the common interests of the working class, the democratic forces, and the popular masses of all countries.

The Conference discussed the situation in Europe and charted the major objectives whose implementation must improve the position of working people in Europe and ensure its peaceful future. A primary objective is to take effective measures for disarmament and to consolidate security in Europe. Another serious target is to develop mutually advantageous cooperation and improve mutual understanding between the peoples of Europe. The participants in the Conference called for the intensification of the struggle for peace, security, cooperation, national independence, and social progress in the whole world. They voiced their support for the struggle of the peoples of newly-free countries for their independence, against imperialism, and for a new international economic order that would meet the interests of their peoples.

The Conference played an important role in intensifying the peoples' struggle for European security, peace, co-operation, and social progress.

The participants in the Conference emphasize that their Parties, on the basis of a political line worked out and adopted by every Party in complete independence in accordance with the socio-economic and political conditions and the specific national features prevailing in the country concerned, are firmly resolved to continue waging a consistent struggle in order to achieve the objectives of peace, democracy and social progress, which is in line with the general interests of the working class, the democratic forces and the mass of the people in all countries.

They state with all clarity that the policy of peaceful coexistence, active cooperation between states irrespective of their social systems, and international détente correspond both to the interests of each people as well as to the cause of progress for the whole of mankind and in no way mean the maintenance of the political and social status quo in the various countries, but on the contrary create optimum conditions for the development of the struggle of the working class and all democratic forces as well as for the implementation of the inalienable right of each and every people freely to choose and follow its own course of development, for the struggle against the rule of the monopolies, and for socialism.

...The concentration on the European continent of extraordinarily strong military forces with the most dangerous destructive capacities at their disposal, the intensified continuation of the arms race, the build-up of ever larger stockpiles of weapons, including weapons of mass destruction, the maintenance of foreign military bases and foreign armed forces on the territory of other states, and imperialist pressure and interference in internal affairs represent a direct source of danger for peace, security and cooperation between states and

are obstacles in the way of the realization of the aspirations of the European peoples to achieve independence and progress.

The policies of imperialism and neo-colonialism and all forms of oppression and exploitation remain the main danger to peace and to the independence and equality of the peoples. At the same time, unequal economic development and inequitable economic and political relations represent a source of tension and conflict, and a serious obstacle in the way of independence and social progress.

The position of imperialism, which has not changed its nature, has been weakened as a consequence of the changes in the balance of forces. This finds its expression in the fact that it is neither capable of reversing the historic achievements of socialism nor of halting the advance of the progressive forces and of the movement for the liberation and independence of the peoples.

The difficulties imperialism is going through are the result of a further aggravation of the general crisis of the capitalist system which affects all spheres of capitalist society—economic, social, moral and political—and manifests itself in various forms and dimensions in different countries. Such characteristic features of the current serious crisis as chronic inflation, the crisis of the monetary system, the fact that productive capacities are increasingly underused, and the unemployment of millions of working people are making themselves felt with particular intensity. Everywhere the crisis entails serious consequences for the working and living conditions of the working class, peasants and farmers, and the middle strata, hitting young people, women and foreign workers especially severely. It is accompanied by manifestations of moral decay and by upheavals which testify to its political nature.

The crisis leads to profound contradictions in international political and economic relations. It is also manifest in serious trade conflicts, in merciless competition between the monopoly groups of various countries, including those of the EEC countries, and in the contradictions between the capitalist monopolies and the developing countries.

All this proves that the economic and social structure of capitalist society is becoming more and more inconsistent with

the needs of the working and popular masses and with the requirements of social progress and of democratic political development.

The working class and all working people in the capitalist-dominated part of Europe are struggling for a democratic way out of the crisis which would correspond to the interests of the broad mass of the people and open up the way for a socialist transformation of society.

The reactionary quarters of big business are attempting to find a way out of the present situation by curtailing the democratic and social rights of the mass of the people and by shifting the burden of the crisis onto them. Furthermore, these forces are striving to obstruct the policy of détente and active cooperation, to undermine the results of the Helsinki Conference and to recreate an atmosphere of tension and confrontation in relations between states. There are still certain forces who are bent on a return to cold war politics, which led to the division of the continent into opposing blocs. Communist Parties and other democratic and peace-loving forces have fought against and continue to fight against these policies.

The arms race must be ended and a process of reducing armaments and armed forces must be initiated. The growing arms expenditure bears down more and more heavily on the working people and the mass of the people. If these huge resources were spent on raising the living standards of the peoples, on overcoming economic backwardness, on aid and support for the developing countries and on environmental protection, this would immensely benefit the advance of all mankind.

The socialist, the non-aligned and other peace-loving countries, the Communist and Workers' Parties, the progressive and democratic forces of Europe are all fighting for these aims. It is of urgent and vital concern to all peoples on our continent to overcome the resistance of reactionary quarters in the NATO countries and of other conservative forces which oppose these aims.

As the Parties participating in the Conference stand for the overcoming of the division of Europe into blocs and for a policy of disarmament, they speak out against any steps inconsistent with this objective.... The Parties participating in

the Conference will continue to work actively for a Europe of peace, cooperation and social progress.

In this spirit, they will develop their internationalist, comradely and voluntary cooperation and solidarity on the basis of the great ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin, strictly adhering to the principles of equality and sovereign independence of each Party, non-interference in internal affairs, and respect for their free choice of different roads in the struggle for social change of a progressive nature and for socialism. The struggle of each Party for socialism in its own country and its responsibility towards the working class and the people of that country are bound up with mutual solidarity among working people of all countries and all progressive movements and peoples in their struggle for freedom and the strengthening of their independence, for democracy, socialism and world peace.

The Communist and Workers' Parties are aware that a Europe of peace and progress can only be the result of many-sided efforts, and the outcome of rapprochement, understanding and cooperation among the broadest political and social forces.

They consider dialogue and cooperation between Communists and all other democratic and peace-loving forces as necessary. In this, they base themselves on what they all have in common and stand for the removal of mistrust and prejudices which may hamper their cooperation.

They consider it their duty to direct the attention of all popular forces to the damage done by aggressive anti-Communism to the development of the movement for peace and progress. The Communist Parties do not consider all those who are not in agreement with their policies or who hold a critical attitude towards their activity as being anti-Communist. Anti-Communism is and remains an instrument which imperialist and reactionary forces use not only against Communists but also against other democrats and against democratic freedoms. These forces are conducting campaigns against the Communist Parties, the socialist countries, beginning with the Soviet Union, against the forces of socialism and progress, campaigns which aim to discredit the policy and the ideals of Communists among the mass of the people and to prevent unity within

the working-class movement and cooperation among the democratic and popular forces. It is in the interests of the aspiration of the popular forces for progress and for democratic development to isolate and overcome anti-Communism. The Communist and Workers' Parties will act in such a way that their policies and the ideals of justice and progress, whose champions they are, become ever more a force promoting the broadest unity of the working people and of the mass of the people.

The participants in the Conference welcome the successes achieved in a number of countries and at international levels in developing cooperation between Communist and socialist or social-democratic parties. They consider that the basic interests of the working class and of all working people require the overcoming of the obstacles which stand in the way of cooperation and which complicate the struggle of the mass of working people against monopoly capital and against the reactionary and conservative forces.

The Communist and Workers' Parties participating in the Conference reaffirm their rejection of any policy or ideology which in essence means the subjection of the working class to the system of capitalism. They underline their determination to work consistently for the strengthening of their Parties and for the extension of their ties with the working class and all working people. At the same time, they stress once again their readiness to contribute towards cooperation, on the basis of equality, with all democratic forces and in particular with the socialist and social-democratic parties in the struggle for peace, democracy and progress for society.

The fight waged by the Communist Parties and other democratic forces in the capitalist countries on our continent for the removal of all vestiges of fascist regimes, for the development of democracy, for peace, and against the ever growing threat which the operations of the international monopolies and the multinational corporations pose to the sovereignty and independence of each and every country, is of great importance for the transformation of Europe into a continent of peace and progress.

The Communist and Workers' Parties participating in the Conference stress that the working people have common

interests and that united action by them plays a decisive role in the effective defence of their rights. They therefore consider it important that all working people, irrespective of their political and religious beliefs, unite their efforts in the struggle for their vital interests.

The influence of the working class is growing through the unification of efforts by its trade union organizations both at national and international levels. Communists will continue in every respect to support the drive for unity which is growing in the trade union organizations and their independent activities.

Ever broader Catholic forces, members of other Christian communities and adherents to other faiths play an important role in the struggle for the rights of the working people and for democracy and peace. The Communist and Workers' Parties recognize the necessity of dialogue and joint action with these forces, which is an inseparable part of the struggle for the development of Europe in a spirit of democracy and in the direction of social progress.

The Communist and Workers' Parties participating in the Conference address themselves to women, whose role in professional life, in everyday social and political struggle is growing, calling upon them to increase their contribution to the common cause of all forces of peace and social progress as a necessary prerequisite for the achievement of genuine equality and liberation for women.

The participants in the Conference support the efforts of young people, in whose hands lies the future of our continent, to take part with growing strength in the struggle for a Europe of peace, progress and freedom which marches forward to a socialist future.

The Communist and Workers' Parties participating in the Conference turn to manual and clerical workers, to peasants and farmers, the middle strata, to members of scientific and technological professions and cultural workers, to all political parties, mass organizations and associations, to all people interested in progress and a peaceful future for Europe and call upon them to work actively for the following objectives:

**I. FOR STRENGTHENING THE PROCESS OF DÉTENTE
BY TAKING EFFECTIVE MEASURES TOWARDS DISARMAMENT
AND TOWARDS STRENGTHENING SECURITY IN EUROPE**

The participants in the Conference call for the strict observance and full implementation of the principles and accords which are contained in the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe and of all treaties and agreements serving the cause of peace and security.

So as to guarantee the durability of détente and to strengthen and extend it further, the decisions adopted in Helsinki must be supported and sustained by the struggle of the mass of the people to implement them fully and completely, to curb and push back the reactionary forces, who reject the results of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe and who seek to thwart the course towards détente and security for the peoples.

The participants in the Conference advocate active campaigning by the mass of the people and all peace-loving forces, *inter alia* through demonstrations of solidarity, in order resolutely to repel all attempts at interference in the internal affairs of any country and to challenge any act encroaching upon the inalienable right of each and every people to determine its own future freely and in sovereignty.

In order to strengthen and deepen détente, it is imperative to take concrete measures for disarmament and for ensuring effective security in Europe through efforts by all countries with a view to overcoming the division of the continent into military blocs. Europe can and must become an example of practical implementation of measures for military détente.

Mass action by the working class, the working people and by all peoples on our continent are of decisive importance for the achievement of these goals.

The Communist and Workers' Parties of Europe emphatically call for energetic efforts to achieve:

— an end to the arms race in all forms, particularly nuclear armament;

— the speeding up of negotiations on question of disarmament in the framework of the United Nations and the implementation of effective measures designed to achieve

general and complete disarmament under strict international control;

— the dismantling of foreign military bases and the withdrawal of foreign troops and armaments from foreign territory and the disbandment of these troops;

— a systematic reduction of the military budgets of all states, primarily of those which possess nuclear weapons and of other states with a large military potential.

It is urgently necessary to remove the danger of nuclear war, the unleashing of which would be the greatest crime against humanity.

This requires:

— the undertaking by all states to renounce the use of, or the threat to use, nuclear weapons and, more generally, to renounce the use or threat of force in international relations under any circumstances whatsoever;

— ending the nuclear arms race including means of delivery of nuclear weapons, and banning all nuclear weapon tests in all media;

— taking effective measures for the withdrawal of nuclear weapons from the territory of other states and preventing the proliferation of such weapons; and establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones as steps towards general and complete disarmament;

— reducing nuclear weapons and their means of delivery, prohibiting and ending the production of all kinds of nuclear weapons and destroying them. It is necessary that all states which so desire be given the opportunity to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, on the basis of equality and without any discrimination.

It is necessary to continue to press for:

— the ratification by all states of the convention on the prohibition and destruction of bacteriological weapons;

— the conclusion at the earliest possible date of a treaty on the prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons and other means of mass annihilation, as well as of a convention on the prohibition of the use of environmental and climatic modification techniques for military purposes;

— the prohibition of the development and production of new kinds of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons;

- measures designed to prevent an accidental occurrence of armed incidents and their escalation into international crises;
- the renunciation of any show of strength directed against any other state or people.

The participants in the Conference advocate the holding of intergovernmental meetings and conferences on problems of disarmament, with provision being made for the equal participation of all states in such conferences or meetings. They hold it desirable to make more comprehensive use of the opportunities provided by the United Nations for these aims.

They advocate the transformation of various regions in Europe and the world into zones of peace and cooperation without foreign troops and military bases.

Considering the close interrelationship between all-European security and the safeguarding of security in the Mediterranean area, the Parties participating in the Conference speak out against the further stock-piling of weapons in this area, for the withdrawal of nuclear-armed vessels from the Mediterranean, for the dismantling of all foreign military bases and, in the process of overcoming the division of Europe into military blocs, for the withdrawal of all foreign naval fleets and troops, which will serve to transform the Mediterranean into a sea of peace.

They call for:

- the strict observance of all treaties and agreements which are designed to limit and end the arms race;
- the reduction of armed forces and armaments, chiefly in regions in which military confrontation is particularly dangerous, but also in other areas of the continent, by concluding such agreements, involving all the states interested, as do not prejudice the security of any of the countries;
- the prevention of the creation of new military blocs or military groupings.

The Communist and Workers' Parties of Europe will come out resolutely against any action directed at intensifying the arms race and stepping up military confrontation.

In the solution of problems of disarmament and security, which are of vital interest to all states and peoples of the world, the security interests of all countries and the equal participation of all states must be guaranteed.

Convinced that overcoming the division of Europe into blocs constitutes an essential contribution to the attainment of lasting security and peace on our continent and in the whole of the world, the participants in the Conference advocate the simultaneous dissolution of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty organization and, as a first step, of their military organizations. They stand for concrete measures leading to this goal.

The participants in the Conference consider it urgently necessary that propaganda for wars of aggression or for the use or threat of force in any form should be ended and prohibited.

Moreover, it is necessary to inform the public at large and all peoples extensively and regularly about the course of negotiations and about measures undertaken towards ending the arms race and towards disarmament.

2. FOR EXTERMINATING FASCISM, DEFENDING DEMOCRACY AND NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE

...For democracy and social progress, for the maintenance of peace and international relations of mutual trust and friendly cooperation it is necessary to eradicate fascism, prevent its rebirth, either in open or disguised forms, and fight against the formation and activities of fascist and neo-fascist terror organizations and groups as well as racialist propaganda and activities which have the object of dividing the working class and other progressive forces. With this in mind, any attempt at applying pressure from without and at interference, no matter where and in whatever form, must be repulsed. Today it is more necessary than ever to step up the struggle for the defence and development of democratic rights in order to halt the increasing tendency of monopoly capital to resort to repressive and authoritarian methods of rule which are a danger to the achievements of the European peoples and their advance on the road of peace and social progress.

The participants in the Conference call for the stepping up of mass campaigns in support of the struggle of the peoples for democracy, national independence and social progress.

3. FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF MUTUALLY BENEFICIAL COOPERATION, FOR BETTER UNDERSTANDING AMONG PEOPLES

The participants in the Conference consider that the development of cooperation involving the most diverse fields of human endeavour serves to strengthen peace and security of the peoples, and to enrich the human personality in the spirit of the ideals of peace, democracy and humanism. A prerequisite and indispensable condition for this is respect for the right of the people of each country to choose and develop its political, economic, social and legal system independently and without outside interference, and to protect and multiply its historical and cultural heritage.

The participants in the Conference call especially on the working class, on peasants and farmers, on intellectual and professional people, on all working people to make this cooperation more democratic in content and to see that their organizations play an active and energetic part in this cooperation.

The participants in the Conference therefore call for action:

— to develop and expand cooperation among states on an all-European basis in keeping with the principles and accords contained in the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference;

— to develop economic cooperation between all European states, irrespective of their economic and social systems, on the basis of equality, respect for the national sovereignty of each and every state and mutual benefit, which presupposes application of the principle of most-favoured-nation treatment and an end to discriminatory practices and restrictions standing in the way of the development of all-European trade. This would be fully in conformity with the interests of the working people's struggle against the consequences of the crisis as well as the interests of the economic development of the countries of Europe;

— to develop cooperation in the spheres of culture, science and technology, education, information and of human contacts among all peoples for the purpose of better mutual acquaintanceship, the strengthening of trust, further rapprochement of the European countries and peoples as well as the spiritual enrichment of human life while fully respecting the equality of rights of each people and every individual, and while observing the sovereignty of each country and the

principle of non-interference in its internal affairs;

— to secure the ratification and strict observance by all European states of the international covenants on human rights elaborated by the United Nations. This is in the interests of the struggle of the working class and all working people for genuine social and political rights, such as the right to work, to an education, to housing, to the requisite social services, to adequate support when old, ill or disabled, for the accomplishment of equality for women and for the genuine participation of working people in social and public decision-making;

— to guarantee for migrant workers the same working conditions and wage levels as the workers of the host country enjoy. The social, cultural and political rights of migrant workers and those of their families should be based on principles of equality with the citizens of the country of employment. Maintenance of their civic rights in their home countries should be guaranteed;

— to ensure the strict and full implementation by all states of the principles relating to national minorities in the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference;

— to intensify, and extend solidarity and support to, the struggle against the policies of multinational monopolies, which have a negative effect on the working and living conditions of the working people and flagrantly violate the national interests of peoples and the sovereignty of states;

— to promote town-twinning, contacts between factory and office staffs and between scientific and cultural institutions, to extend the exchange of educational visits by delegations of various organizations and associations, and to encourage tourism;

— to ensure that mass media everywhere will, on the basis of objective information, be placed in the service of mutual acquaintanceship, the dissemination of ideas for a better understanding and the strengthening of an atmosphere of trust and cooperation among peoples;

— to expand the exchange of cultural property and art treasures, which serves the realization of the ideals of justice, freedom, fraternity and friendship among the peoples. The participants in the Conference call upon scientific and cultural workers and artists to broaden cooperation in this field.

**4. FOR PEACE, SECURITY, COOPERATION,
NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE AND SOCIAL
PROGRESS IN THE WHOLE OF THE WORLD**

The Communist and Workers' Parties participating in the Conference are convinced that the struggle for a Europe of peace, cooperation and social progress is an important contribution to the solution of the political, economic and social problems facing the world at large, which calls for the participation of all countries on equal terms. The positive changes on this continent are providing favourable conditions for peoples' liberation struggles, the struggle against the danger of war, for détente in other parts of the world, and for the struggle of the peoples against neo-colonialism and against all forms of national oppression. The Communist and Workers' Parties of Europe underline the great importance of the obligation undertaken by the countries which participated in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe to develop their relations with all countries in the spirit of the principles agreed upon in Helsinki.

At the same time the struggle waged by the peoples of newly independent countries against imperialism and any forms of domination and exploitation, and for the establishment of a new international economic order meeting the interests of the peoples is of great importance for the transformation of the world along progressive lines and a powerful support in the struggle of the European peoples for peace, security, cooperation and social progress...

The democratization of international relations and the development of international cooperation on the basis of equality and of mutual benefit to all peoples are aims of great importance in the struggle for the establishment of an international community free from imperialism and neo-colonialism wherein the great disproportions between developed and developing countries can be overcome, and which will be based on the full independence of each and every nation and on their active participation in the solution of mankind's problems.

Broad international cooperation becomes ever more necessary for safeguarding peace, achieving a just settlement of international conflicts, strengthening security and implement-

ing practical steps towards disarmament. This cooperation is necessary to further the establishment of new and equitable international economic relations. Such cooperation would also contribute to solving such complicated and fundamental problems as hunger in the world, illiteracy, environmental protection, pollution of the atmosphere and the seas, and those involved in developing and utilizing new sources of energy, averting natural calamities, and preventing and curing the most harmful diseases.

This calls for the elimination of colonialism and neo-colonialism; the establishment of a new international economic order; the ensuring of conditions for the social and economic development of all countries, primarily the least developed countries; the organization of broad international cooperation which should assist the peoples in the developing countries in their own efforts to remove the gap between these and the developed countries; the unrestricted exercise by each people of the right to sovereign control over its national resources; access by all countries to the achievements of modern science and technology; the establishment of a just relationship between prices for raw materials and agricultural products and prices for manufactured goods; and a broad development of trade relations without any artificial barriers and discriminatory practices. The European countries have a very significant contribution to make to these objectives.

The socialist countries, the movement of non-aligned countries, the revolutionary and progressive forces in the developing countries and the working-class and democratic movements are fighting for the establishment of new international political and economic relations on the basis of justice and equality. Ever wider political and economic circles in the capitalist countries are also contributing to the realization of this demand of our time. Such relations serve the cause of peace, détente and social progress throughout the world and meet fully the interests of the working class and the mass of the people in Europe.

The Communist and Workers' Parties participating in the Conference attach great importance to the role played by the United Nations in settling international problems with equal participation by all states, in developing cooperation and

understanding between states, in strengthening security and in guaranteeing lasting peace all over the world.

The participants in the Conference call on the working people and all democratic and peace-loving forces in Europe to make renewed efforts and organize new campaigns for strengthening solidarity with all peoples of the world in the struggle for their freedom and independence. This is becoming the most important factor for the strengthening of their social and national equality and is at the same time an important contribution to the cause of peace, security and social progress the world over.

The participants in the Conference are of the opinion that the attainment of the aims advocated by them would constitute an important advance along the road leading to the transformation of Europe into a continent of peace, security, cooperation and social progress. They underline their determination to turn to account the possibilities brought about by détente for achieving tangible results which meet the class interests of the working people as well as the national interests of each and every people and the interests of progress for all humanity.

The Communist and Workers' Parties represented at the Conference advocate constructive dialogue with all other democratic forces, each of these forces fully retaining its identity and independence, so as to arrive at fruitful cooperation in the struggle for peace, security and social progress. They call on the working class, on peasants and farmers, on the middle strata, on the representatives of science and culture, on women, on young people, on all progressive, democratic and peace-loving forces and parties, and on the democratic mass organizations to step up their efforts in the interests of a peaceful future and the flourishing of all nations and peoples on our continent.

More than three decades have passed since the great victory over fascism. By transforming Europe into a continent of lasting peace we shall pay the highest tribute to all those who fought and laid down their lives for this victory. The Communist and Workers' Parties participating in the Berlin

Conference are convinced that the attainment of the great objectives defined at their meeting is in the best interests of all peoples and will be a major contribution to the cause of peace, national independence, democracy and socialism all over the world.

Extract from: PROGRAMME OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION

In all its activities related to revolutionary remaking of society the CPSU is guided by its basic theoretical document, namely its Programme. The latter indicates the Party's ultimate goals and its major tasks for a given historical period. These goals and tasks are established on the basis of Marxist-Leninist theory and the experience of the international communist and working-class movement, of which the CPSU is a component part.

Throughout its history, the CPSU adopted three Programmes. The first one was adopted by the Second Party Congress in 1903. It was worked out with V. I. Lenin's direct participation and was a truly Marxist Programme, which posed the task of accomplishing bourgeois-democratic and socialist revolutions in Russia. The first Party Programme was fulfilled as a result of the 1917 Great October Socialist Revolution. The second Party Programme was adopted by the Eighth Party Congress in 1919. It embodied V. I. Lenin's plan for building socialism in the USSR, and was also successfully implemented. In the 22nd CPSU Congress adopted the third Party Programme, aimed at building a communist society in the USSR, and that Programme is still in force today.

The extracts from the third CPSU Programme cited below characterise the present-day epoch, whose principal essence lies in the transition of mankind from capitalism to socialism. Socialist and national liberation revolutions leading to the collapse of imperialism are gaining increasing impetus the world over; imperialism's shameful colonial system is being eliminated once and for all, and more and more peoples are taking the road to socialism.

The CPSU Programme substantiates the historical inevitability of the transition from capitalism to socialism. Its important conclusion is that the entire world capitalist system has on the whole matured for a socialist revolution, and that imperialism has entered the period of decline and complete

destruction. The initial breakthrough in the chain of imperialist oppression of the world's peoples occurred in 1917 as a result of the revolutionary struggle of Russia's working class and working people, whom the Communist Party of the Soviet Union led to victory. The CPSU Programme reveals the world-wide historical importance of the 1917 October Revolution and the victory of socialism in the USSR.

The Sections cited below characterise the major tasks for building a communist society in the USSR. They explain what is communism and indicate how co-operation among socialist countries would develop during construction of a classless communist society in the USSR.

Part One

THE TRANSITION FROM CAPITALISM TO COMMUNISM IS THE ROAD OF HUMAN PROGRESS

1. The Historical Necessity of the Transition from Capitalism to Socialism

The epoch-making turn of mankind from capitalism to socialism, initiated by the October Revolution, is a natural result of the development of society. Marxism-Leninism discovered the objective laws of social development and revealed the contradictions inherent in capitalism, the inevitability of their bringing about a revolutionary explosion and of the transition of society to communism.

Capitalism is the last exploiting system. Having developed its productive forces to an enormous extent, it became a tremendous obstacle to social progress. Capitalism alone is responsible for the fact that the twentieth century, a century of colossal growth of the productive forces and of great scientific progress, has not yet put an end to the poverty of hundreds of millions of people, has not provided an abundance of material and spiritual values for all men on earth. The growing conflict between productive forces and production relations imperatively demands that mankind should break the decayed capitalist shell, release the powerful productive forces created by man and use them for the good of society as a whole.

Whatever the specific character of the rise and development of capitalism in any country, that system has everywhere common features and objective laws.

The development of world capitalism and of the revolutionary struggle of the working class has fully confirmed the correctness of the Marxist-Leninist analysis of capitalism and its highest stage, imperialism, given in the first and second Programmes of the Party. The basic propositions of this analysis are also given below in the present Programme.

Under capitalism, the basic and decisive means of production belong to the numerically small class of capitalists and landowners, while the vast majority of the population consists of proletarians and semi-proletarians, who own no means of production and are therefore compelled to sell their labour-

power and by their labour create profits and riches for the ruling classes of society. The bourgeois state, whatever its form, is an instrument of the domination of labour by capital.

The development of large-scale capitalist production—production for profit, for the appropriation of surplus value—leads to the elimination of small independent producers, makes them wholly dependent on capital. Capitalism extensively exploits female and child labour. The economic laws of its development necessarily give rise to a huge army of unemployed, which is constantly replenished by ruined peasants and urban petty bourgeoisie. The exploitation of the working class and all working people is continuously increasing, social inequality is becoming more and more marked, the gulf between the haves and havenots is widening, and the sufferings and privations of the millions are growing worse.

Capitalism, by concentrating millions of workers in its factories, socialising the process of labour, imparts a social character to production; nevertheless it is the capitalists who appropriate the fruits of labour. This fundamental contradiction of capitalism—the contradiction between the social character of production and the private-capitalist form of appropriation—manifests itself in production anarchy and in the fact that the purchasing power of society falls short of the expansion of production and leads periodically to destructive economic crises. Crises and periods of industrial stagnation, in turn, are still more ruinous to small producers, increase the dependence of wage-labour on capital and lead more rapidly to a relative, and sometimes an absolute, deterioration of the condition of the working class.

The growth and development of the contradictions of bourgeois society are accompanied by the growing discontent of the working and exploited masses with the capitalist system, by an increase in the number of proletarians and their greater unity, and by a sharpening of their struggle against the exploiters. At the same time there is an accelerated *creation of the material conditions that make possible the replacement of capitalist by communist production relations, that is, the accomplishment of the social revolution which is the aim of the Communist Party, the politically conscious exponent of the class movement of the proletariat.*

The working class, which is the most consistent revolutionary class, is the chief motive force of the revolutionary transformation of the world. In the course of class struggles it becomes organised, sets up its trade unions and political parties, and wages an economic, political and theoretical struggle against capitalism. In fulfilling its historic mission as the revolutionary remaker of the old society and creator of a new system, the working class becomes the exponent, not only of its own class interests, but of the interests of all working people. It is the natural leader of all forces fighting against capitalism.

The dictatorship of the proletariat and the leadership of the Marxist-Leninist party are indispensable conditions for the triumph of the socialist revolution and the building of socialism. The firm alliance of the working class and the working peasant masses under the leadership of the working class is the supreme principle of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The process of concentration and centralisation of capital, while destroying free competition, led in the early twentieth century to the establishment of powerful capitalist monopoly associations—syndicates, cartels, and trusts—which acquired decisive importance in the economy, led to the merging of bank capital and immensely concentrated industrial capital, and to intensive export of capital. The trusts, which encompassed entire groups of capitalist powers, began the economic division of a world already divided territorially among the wealthiest countries. Capitalism had entered its final stage, the stage of monopoly capitalism, of imperialism.

The period of a more or less smooth spread of capitalism all over the globe gave way to spasmodic, cataclysmic development causing an unprecedented growth and aggravation of all the contradictions of capitalism—economic, political, class, and national. The imperialist powers' struggle for markets, for spheres of capital investment, for raw materials and labour, and for world domination became more intense than ever. In an epoch of the undivided rule of imperialism, that struggle necessarily led to devastating wars.

Imperialism is decaying and moribund capitalism; it is the eve of the socialist revolution. *The world capitalist*

system as a whole is ripe for the social revolution of the proletariat.

The exceedingly high degree of development of world capitalism in general; the replacement of free competition by state-monopoly capitalism; the establishment, by banks as well as associations of capitalists, of machinery for the social regulation of production and the distribution of products; the growing cost of living and the oppression of the working class by the syndicates, connected with the growth of capitalist monopolies; the enslavement of the working class by the imperialist state, and the immensely increased difficulty of the economic and political struggle of the proletariat; and the horrors, hardships, and ruination brought about by imperialist war have all made inevitable the downfall of capitalism and the transition to a higher type of social economy.

The revolutionary break-up of imperialism does not take place all over the world simultaneously. The uneven character of the economic and political development of the capitalist countries under imperialism leads to revolutions occurring at different periods in different countries. V. I. Lenin developed the theory of the socialist revolution in new historical conditions, elaborated the theory of the possibility of socialism triumphing first in one capitalist country taken singly.

Russia was the weakest link in the imperialist system and the focal point of all its contradictions. On the other hand, all the conditions necessary for the victory of socialism arose in her. Her working class was the most revolutionary and best organised in the world and had considerable experience of class struggle. It was led by a Marxist-Leninist party armed with an advanced revolutionary theory and steeled in class battles.

The Bolshevik Party brought together in one revolutionary torrent the struggle of the working class for socialism, the country-wide peace movement, the peasants' struggle for land, and the national-liberation movement of the oppressed peoples of Russia, and directed these forces to the overthrow of capitalism.

II. The Historic Significance of the October Revolution and of the Victory of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.

The Great October Revolution breached the imperialist front in Russia, one of the world's largest countries, firmly established the dictatorship of the proletariat and created a new type of state—the Soviet socialist state, and a new type of democracy—democracy for the working people.

Workers' and peasants' power, born of the revolution, took Russia out of the bloodbath of the imperialist war, saved her from the national catastrophe to which the exploiting classes had doomed her, and delivered her peoples from the danger of enslavement by foreign capital.

The October Revolution undermined the economic basis of a system of exploitation and social injustice. Soviet power nationalised industry, the railways, banks, and the land. It abolished the landlord system and fulfilled the peasants' age-long dream of land.

The October Revolution smashed the chains of national oppression; it proclaimed and put into effect the right of nations to self-determination, up to and including the right to secede. The Revolution completely abolished the social-estate and class privileges of the exploiters. For the first time in history, it emancipated women and granted them the same rights as men.

The socialist revolution in Russia shook the entire structure of world capitalism to its very foundations; the world split into two opposing systems.

For the first time there emerged in the international arena a state which put forward the great slogan of peace and began carrying through new principles in relations between peoples and countries. Mankind acquired a reliable bulwark in its struggle against wars of conquest, for peace and the security of the peoples.

The October Revolution led the country on to the road of socialism. The path which the Soviet people were to traverse was an unexplored and arduous one. The reactionary forces of the old world did all they could to strangle the Soviet state at its birth. The young Soviet Republic had to cope with intervention and civil war, economic blockade and disruption,

conspiracies, sabotage, subversion, terrorism, and numerous other trials. Socialist construction was rendered incredibly difficult by the socio-economic, technical and cultural backwardness of the country. The victorious workers and peasants lacked knowledge of state administration and the experience necessary for the construction of a new society. The difficulties of socialist construction were greatly increased by the fact that for almost thirty years the U.S.S.R. was the world's only socialist state, and was subjected to incisive attacks by the hostile capitalist encirclement. The class struggle in the period of transition from capitalism to socialism was therefore acute.

The enemies of Leninism maintained that Russia was not mature enough for a socialist revolution, that it was impossible to build socialism in one country. But the enemies of Leninism were put to shame.

A wise, discerning policy, the greatest staunchness, organisation, and deep faith in their own strength and in the strength of the people were required of the Party of the working class. It was necessary to steer the right course in socialist construction and ensure the victory of socialism, despite the highly complicated international situation and a relatively weak industrial basis, in a country whose economy had been badly ravaged by war and where small-commodity production was overwhelmingly predominant.

The Party proved equal to that historic task. Under the leadership of Lenin it worked out a plan for the radical transformation of the country, for the construction of socialism. On the basis of a thorough scientific analysis, Lenin elaborated the policy of the proletarian state for the entire period of transition from capitalism to socialism. He evolved the New Economic Policy (NEP), designed to bring about the victory of socialism. The main elements of the Lenin plan for the building of a socialist society were industrialisation of the country, agricultural co-operation, and the cultural revolution.

The Party upheld that plan in an acute struggle against sceptics and capitulators, against the Trotskyists, Right opportunists, nationalist-deviators, and other hostile groups. It rallied the whole of the Soviet people to the struggle to put Lenin's programme into practice.

The point at issue at the time was: either perish or forge full steam ahead and overtake the capitalist countries economically.

The Soviet state had first of all to solve the problem of *industrialisation*. In a historically brief period, without outside help, the Soviet Union built up a large-scale modern industry. By the time it had fulfilled three five-year plans (1929-41) the Soviet Union had become a mighty industrial power that had achieved complete economic independence from the capitalist countries. Its defence capacity had increased immeasurably. *The industrialisation of the U.S.S.R. was a great exploit performed by the working class and the people as a whole*, for they spared no effort or means, and consciously made sacrifices to lift the country out of its backward state.

The destiny of socialism in a country like the U.S.S.R. largely depended on the solution of a most difficult problem, namely, the transition from a small-scale, dispersed peasant economy to *socialist co-operation*. Led by the Party, aided and fully supported by the working class, the peasantry took the road of socialism. Millions of small individual farms went into voluntary association to form collective farms. A large number of Soviet state farms and machine and tractor stations were established. The introduction in the Soviet countryside of large-scale socialist farming meant *a great revolution in economic relations, in the entire way of life of the peasantry*. Collectivisation for ever delivered the countryside from kulak bondage, from class differentiation, ruin, and poverty. The real solution of the eternal peasant question was provided by the Lenin co-operative plan.

To build socialism it was necessary to raise the cultural level of the people; this too was successfully accomplished. A *cultural revolution* was carried out in the country. It freed the working people from spiritual slavery and ignorance and gave them access to the cultural values accumulated by mankind. The country, the bulk of whose population had been illiterate, made breath-taking progress in science and culture.

Socialism, which Marx and Engels scientifically predicted as inevitable and the plan for the construction of which was mapped out by Lenin, has become a reality in the Soviet Union.

Socialism has done away for ever with the supremacy of

private ownership of the means of production, that source of the division of society into antagonistic classes. Socialist ownership of the means of production has become the solid economic foundation of society. Unlimited opportunities have been afforded for the development of the productive forces.

Socialism has solved a great social problem—it has abolished the exploiting classes and the causes engendering the exploitation of man by man. There are now two friendly classes in the U.S.S.R.—the working class and the peasantry. And these classes, furthermore, have changed. The common character of the two forms of socialist property has brought the working class and the collective-farm peasantry close together; it has strengthened their alliance and made their friendship indestructible. A new intelligentsia, coming from the people and devoted to socialism, has emerged. The one-time antithesis between town and countryside, between labour by hand and by brain, has been abolished. The indestructible socio-political and ideological unity of the Soviet people has been built on the basis of the common vital interests of the workers, peasants and intellectuals.

The socialist principle "From each according to his abilities, to each according to his work" has been put into effect in the Soviet Union. This principle ensures that the members of society have a material interest in the fruits of their labour; it makes it possible to harmonise personal and social interests in the most effective way and serves as a powerful stimulus for increasing productivity of labour, developing the economy and raising the people's standard of living. The awareness that they work for themselves and their society and not for exploiters inspires the working people with labour enthusiasm; it encourages their effort for innovation, their creative initiative, and mass socialist emulation. Socialism is creative effort by the working masses. The growing activity of the people in the building of a new life is a law of the socialist epoch.

The aim of socialism is to meet the growing material and cultural requirements of the people ever more fully by continuously developing and improving social production.

The entire life of socialist society is based on the principle of broad *democracy*. Working people take an active part, through the Soviets, trade unions, and other mass organisa-

tions, in managing the affairs of the state and in solving problems of economic and cultural advancement. Socialist democracy includes both political freedoms—freedom of speech, of the press and of assembly, the right to elect and to be elected, and also social rights—the right to work, to rest and leisure, to free education and free medical services, to material security in old age and in case of illness or disability; equality of citizens of all races and nationalities; equal rights for women and men in all spheres of political, economic and cultural activity. Socialist democracy, unlike bourgeois democracy, does not merely proclaim the rights of the people, but guarantees that they are really implemented. Soviet society ensures the real liberty of the individual. The highest manifestation of this liberty is man's emancipation from exploitation, which is what primarily constitutes genuine social justice.

Socialism has created the most favourable conditions for the rapid progress of science. The achievements of Soviet science clearly show the superiority of the socialist system and testify to the unlimited possibilities of scientific progress and to the growing role of science under socialism. It is only logical that the country of victorious socialism should have ushered in the era of the utilisation of atomic energy for peaceful purposes, and that it should have blazed a trail into outer space. The man-made satellites of the earth and the sun, powerful space rockets and interplanetary spaceships, atomic power stations and the first triumphal orbitings of the globe, accomplished by Soviet citizens, which are a source of pride to all mankind, have become symbols of the creative energy of ascendant communism.

The solution of the *national question* is one of the greatest achievements of socialism. This question is of especial importance to a country like the Soviet Union, inhabited by more than a hundred nations and nationalities. Socialist society has not only guaranteed the political equality of nations and created Soviet national statehood, but has also abolished the economic and cultural inequality inherited from the old system. With reciprocal fraternal assistance, primarily from the great Russian people, all the Soviet non-Russian republics have set up their own modern industries, trained their own national working class and intelligentsia and

developed a culture that is national in form and socialist in content. Many peoples which in the past were backward have achieved socialism bypassing the capitalist stage of development. The union and consolidation of equal peoples on a voluntary basis in a single multinational state—the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—their close co-operation in state, economic and cultural development, their fraternal friendship and flourishing economy and culture constitute the most important result of the Leninist national policy.

To the Soviet people fell the historic role of starting on a new road, of blazing a new path of social development. This required special efforts of them, a continuous quest for forms and methods of building the new society that had to be tested in the crucible of life. For nearly two out of little more than four decades, the Soviet people were compelled to devote their energies to the repulsion of invasions by the imperialist powers and to post-war economic rehabilitation. The Soviet system was put to a particularly severe test during the Great Patriotic War, the most trying war in history. By winning that war, the Soviet people proved that there are no forces in the world capable of stopping the progress of socialist society.

What are the principal lessons to be learned from the experience of the Soviet people?

Soviet experience has shown that the peoples are able to achieve socialism only as a result of *the socialist revolution and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat*. Despite certain specific features due to the concrete historical conditions of socialist construction in the Soviet Union, then in a hostile capitalist encirclement, this experience has fully confirmed the fundamental principles of socialist revolution and socialist construction, principles which are of universal significance.

Soviet experience has shown that socialism alone can put an end to the exploitation of man by man, production anarchy, economic crises, unemployment and the poverty of the people, and ensure planned, continuous and rapid development of the economy and steady improvement of the people's standard of living.

Soviet experience has shown that the working class can fulfil its historic mission as the builder of a new society only

in a firm *alliance with the non-proletarian working masses, primarily the peasantry.*

Soviet experience has shown that the victory of the socialist revolution alone provides all possibilities and conditions for the abolition of all national oppression, *for the voluntary union of free and equal nations and nationalities in a single state.*

Soviet experience has shown that *the socialist state* is the main instrument for the socialist transformation of society. The state organises and unites the masses, exercises planned leadership of economic and cultural construction, and safeguards the revolutionary gains of the people.

Soviet experience has shown that *socialism and peace are inseparable.* The might of socialism serves peace. The Soviet Union saved mankind from fascist enslavement. The Soviet state, which champions peace and implements the Leninist principle of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, is a mighty barrier to imperialist aggression.

Soviet experience has fully borne out the Marxist-Leninist theory that *the Communist Party plays a decisive role* in the formation and development of socialist society. Only a party that steadfastly pursues a class, proletarian policy, and is equipped with progressive, revolutionary theory, only a party solidly united and closely linked with the masses, can organise the people and lead them to the victory of socialism.

Soviet experience has shown that fidelity to the principles of *proletarian internationalism*, their firm and unwavering implementation and defence against all enemies and opportunists, are imperative conditions for the victory of socialism.

The world's greatest revolution and the socialist reorganisation of society, which has attained unprecedented heights in its development and prosperity, have confirmed in practice the historical truth of *Leninism* and have delivered a crushing blow to social-reformist ideology.

As a result of the devoted labour of the Soviet people and the theoretical and practical activities of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, *there exists in the world a socialist society that is a reality and a science of socialist construction that has been tested in practice. The highroad to socialism has been paved.* Many peoples are already marching along it, and it will be taken sooner or later by all peoples...

Part Two

THE TASKS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION IN BUILDING A COMMUNIST SOCIETY

Communism—the Bright Future of All Mankind

The building of a communist society has become an immediate practical task for the Soviet people. The gradual development of socialism into communism is an objective law; it has been prepared by the development of Soviet socialist society throughout the preceding period.

What is communism?

Communism is a classless social system with one form of public ownership of the means of production and full social equality of all members of society; under it, the all-round development of people will be accompanied by the growth of the productive forces through continuous progress in science and technology; all the springs of co-operative wealth will flow more abundantly, and the great principle "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs" will be implemented. Communism is a highly organised society of free, socially conscious working people in which public self-government will be established, a society in which labour for the good of society will become the prime vital requirement of everyone, a necessity recognised by one and all, and the ability of each person will be employed to the greatest benefit of the people.

A high degree of communist consciousness, industry, discipline, and devotion to the public interest are qualities typifying the man of communist society.

Communism ensures the continuous development of social production and rising labour productivity through rapid scientific and technological progress; it equips man with the best and most powerful machines, greatly increases his power over nature and enables him to control its elemental forces to an ever greater extent. The social economy reaches the highest stage of planned organisation, and the most effective and rational use is made of the material wealth and labour reserves to meet the growing requirements of the members of society.

Under communism there will be no classes, and the socio-economic and cultural distinctions, and differences in living conditions, between town and countryside will disappear; the countryside will rise to the level of the town in the development of the productive forces and the nature of work, the forms of production relations, living conditions and the well-being of the population. With the victory of communism mental and physical labour will merge organically in the production activity of people. The intelligentsia will no longer be a distinct social stratum. Workers by hand will have risen in cultural and technological standards to the level of workers by brain.

Thus, communism will put an end to the division of society into classes and social strata, whereas the whole history of mankind, with the exception of its primitive period, was one of class society. Division into opposing classes led to the exploitation of man by man, class struggle, and antagonisms between nations and states.

Under communism all people will have equal status in society, will stand in the same relation to the means of production, will enjoy equal conditions of work and distribution, and will actively participate in the management of public affairs. Harmonious relations will be established between the individual and society on the basis of the unity of public and personal interests. For all their diversity, the requirements of people will express the sound, reasonable requirements of the fully developed person.

The purpose of communist production is to ensure uninterrupted progress of society and to provide all its members with material and cultural benefits according to their growing needs, their individual requirements and tastes. People's requirements will be satisfied from public sources. Articles of personal use will be in the full ownership of each member of society and will be at his disposal.

Communist society, which is based on highly organised production and advanced technology, alters the character of work, but it does not release the members of society from work. It will by no means be a society of anarchy, idleness and inactivity. Every able-bodied person will participate in social labour and thereby ensure the steady growth of the material and spiritual wealth of society. Thanks to the

changed character of labour, its better technical equipment and the high degree of consciousness of all members of society, the latter will work willingly for the public benefit according to their own inclinations.

Communist production demands high standards of organisation, precision and discipline, which are ensured not by compulsion, but through an understanding of public duty, and are determined by the whole pattern of life in communist society. Labour and discipline will not be a burden to people; labour will no longer be a mere source of livelihood—it will be a genuinely creative process and a source of joy.

Communism represents the highest form of organisation of public life. All production units and self-governing associations will be harmoniously united in a common planned economy and a uniform rhythm of social labour.

Under communism the nations will draw closer and closer together in all spheres on the basis of a complete identity of economic, political and spiritual interests, of fraternal friendship and co-operation.

Communism is the system under which the abilities and talents of free man, his best moral qualities, blossom forth and reveal themselves in full...

VI. Communist Construction in the U.S.S.R and Co-Operation of the Socialist Countries

The C.P.S.U. regards communist construction in the Soviet Union as a component of the building of communist society by the peoples of the entire world socialist system.

The fact that socialist revolutions took place at different times and that the economic and cultural levels of the countries concerned are dissimilar, predetermines the non-simultaneous completion of socialist construction in those countries and their non-simultaneous entry into the period of the full-scale construction of communism. Nevertheless, the fact that the socialist countries are developing as members of a single world socialist system and utilising the objective laws and advantages of this system *enables them to reduce the time necessary for the construction of socialism and offers them the prospect of effecting the transition to communism more or less simultaneously, within one and the same historical epoch.*

The first country to advance to communism facilitates and accelerates the advance of the entire world socialist system to communism. In building communism, the peoples of the Soviet Union are breaking new roads for mankind, testing their correctness by their own experience, bringing out difficulties, finding ways and means of overcoming them, and selecting the best forms and methods of communist construction.

Since the social forces—the working class, the co-operative peasantry and the people's intelligentsia—and the social forms of economy (enterprises based on the two forms of socialist property) in the Soviet Union and in the other socialist countries are of one type, there will be common basic objective laws for communist construction in the U.S.S.R. and in those countries, with due allowance made for the historical and national peculiarities of each country.

The construction of communism in the U.S.S.R. promotes the interests of every country of the socialist community, for it increases the economic might and defence potential of the world socialist camp and provides progressively favourable opportunities for the U.S.S.R. to expand its economic and cultural co-operation with the other socialist countries and increase the assistance and support it renders them.

The C.P.S.U. maintains that the existing forms of economic relations between the socialist countries—foreign trade, co-ordination of economic plans, and specialisation and combination of production—will be developed and perfected more and more.

The socialist system makes possible the abolition of the disparities in the economic and cultural development of countries inherited from capitalism, the more rapid development of the countries whose economy lagged behind under capitalism, the steady promotion of their economies and cultures with the purpose of evening up the general level of development of the countries of the socialist community. This is ensured by the advantages of the socialist economic system and by equality in economic relations; by mutual assistance and the sharing of experience, specifically, by reciprocal exchanges of scientific and technological achievements and by co-ordinated research; by the joint construction of industrial projects and by co-operation in the development of natural

resources. All-round fraternal co-operation benefits every socialist country and the world socialist system as a whole.

It is in the best interest of socialist and communist construction that each socialist country combines the effort to strengthen and develop its national economy with the effort to expand economic co-operation of the socialist community as a whole. The development and levelling of the economy of the socialist countries must be achieved primarily by every country using its internal resources to the full, by improving the forms and methods of economic leadership, steadily applying the Leninist principles and methods of socialist economic management, and making effective use of the advantages of the world socialist system.

Material prerequisites for the construction of communism are created by the labour of the people of the country concerned and by its steadily growing contribution to the common cause—the consolidation of the socialist system. This purpose is served by the application in socialist construction of the law of planned, proportionate development; encouragement of the creative initiative and labour activity of the masses; continuous perfection of the system of the international division of labour through the co-ordination of national economic plans, specialisation and combination of production within the world socialist system on the basis of voluntary participation, mutual benefit and an overall improvement of the level of science and engineering; the study of collective experience; the promotion of co-operation and fraternal mutual assistance; strict adherence to the principles of material incentive and the all-round promotion of moral stimuli to work for the good of society; control over the measure of labour and rate of consumption.

Socialism brings peoples and countries together. In the course of extensive co-operation in all economic, socio-political and cultural fields, the common economic basis of world socialism will be consolidated.

The objective laws of the world socialist system, the growth of the productive forces of socialist society, and the vital interests of the peoples of the socialist countries predetermine an increasing affinity of the various national economies. As Lenin foresaw, tendencies develop toward the future creation of a world communist economy regulated by the victorious

working people according to one single plan.

The C.P.S.U., in community with the Communist parties of the other socialist countries, regards the following as its tasks:

in the *political* field, the utmost strengthening of the world socialist system; promotion of fraternal relations with all the socialist countries on lines of complete equality and voluntary co-operation; political consolidation of the countries of the socialist community for joint struggle against imperialist aggressors, for universal peace and for the complete triumph of communism;

in the *economic* field, expansion of trade between the socialist countries; development of the international socialist division of labour; increasing co-ordination of long-range economic plans of the socialist countries to ensure a maximum saving of social labour and an accelerated development of the world socialist economy; the promotion of scientific and technical co-operation;

in the *cultural* field, steady development of all forms of cultural co-operation and intercourse between the peoples of the socialist countries; exchanges of cultural achievements; encouragement of joint creative effort by scientists, writers and artists; extensive measures to ensure the mutual enrichment of national cultures and bring the mode of life and the spiritual cast of the socialist nations closer together.

The C.P.S.U. and the Soviet people will do everything in their power to support all the peoples of the socialist community in the construction of socialism and communism.

**From: CONSTITUTION (FUNDAMENTAL LAW)
OF THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS**

In the draft of a new Soviet Constitution was subjected to the nation-wide discussion and subsequently adopted. It secured legislatively the social system established in the USSR through construction of a developed socialist society. Cited below are the main parts of the Constitution of the USSR.

The Constitution of the USSR reflects the new creative contribution of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to the theory of scientific communism, namely to the teaching of developed socialism. This doctrine summarises the experience of great revolutionary transformations and gives an overall characteristic of developed socialism as the present-day highest stage of social progress. It also reveals the specifics of the Soviet social and state system and of the Soviet policies inherent in this stage of development. The Constitution of the USSR substantiates the tenet that developed socialism is a natural stage on the way to communism.

The Constitution contains a new important tenet from the theory of scientific communism, namely, that now that the dictatorship of the proletariat has achieved its objective, the Soviet state has become a state of the whole people. In this connection, the Constitution shows the essence of the political and legal foundations of the world's first socialist state of the whole people.

The Constitution of the USSR convincingly shows that the socialist state of the whole people represents the highest stage of democracy characterised by considerably broader rights and freedoms of Soviet citizens, rights and freedoms that are not just declared, but secured in reality and constitutionally guaranteed. All Soviet citizens are equal before the law irrespective of their origin, social and property status, race, nationality, and other factors.

The Constitution has legislatively secured the foundations of Soviet foreign policy as those of a Leninist policy of peace

and broad international co-operation. Chapter 4 of the Constitution emphasises that this policy is aimed at securing favourable international conditions for building communism in the USSR; at defending Soviet state's interests; at strengthening the positions of world socialism; at supporting the struggle of peoples for their national liberation and social progress; and at preventing aggressive wars, attaining universal and complete disarmament, and consistently implementing the principle of peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems.

The Great October Socialist Revolution, made by the workers and peasants of Russia under the leadership of the Communist Party headed by Lenin, overthrew capitalist and landowner rule, broke the fetters of oppression, established the dictatorship of the proletariat, and created the Soviet state, a new type of state, the basic instrument for defending the gains of the revolution and for building socialism and communism. Humanity thereby began the epoch-making turn from capitalism to socialism.

After achieving victory in the Civil War and repulsing imperialist intervention, the Soviet government carried through far-reaching social and economic transformations, and put an end once and for all to exploitation of man by man, antagonisms between classes, and strife between nationalities. The unification of the Soviet Republics in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics multiplied the forces and opportunities of the peoples of the country in the building of socialism. Social ownership of the means of production and genuine democracy for the working masses were established. For the first time in the history of mankind a socialist society was created.

The strength of socialism was vividly demonstrated by the immortal feat of the Soviet people and their Armed Forces in achieving their historic victory in the Great Patriotic War. This victory consolidated the influence and international standing of the Soviet Union and created new opportunities for growth of the forces of socialism, national liberation, democracy, and peace throughout the world.

Continuing their creative endeavours, the working people of the Soviet Union have ensured rapid, all-round development of the country and steady improvement of the socialist system. They have consolidated the alliance of the working class, collective-farm peasantry, and people's intelligentsia, and friendship of the nations and nationalities of the USSR. Socio-political and ideological unity of Soviet society, in

which the working class is the leading force, has been achieved. The aims of the dictatorship of the proletariat having been fulfilled, the Soviet state has become a state of the whole people. The leading role of the Communist Party, the vanguard of all the people, has grown.

In the USSR a developed socialist society has been built. At this stage, when socialism is developing on its own foundations, the creative forces of the new system and the advantages of the socialist way of life are becoming increasingly evident, and the working people are more and more widely enjoying the fruits of their great revolutionary gains.

It is a society in which powerful productive forces and progressive science and culture have been created, in which the well-being of the people is constantly rising, and more and more favourable conditions are being provided for the all-round development of the individual.

It is a society of mature socialist social relations, in which, on the basis of the drawing together of all classes and social strata and of the juridical and factual equality of all its nations and nationalities and their fraternal co-operation, a new historical community of people has been formed—the Soviet people.

It is a society of high organisational capacity, ideological commitment, and consciousness of the working people, who are patriots and internationalists.

It is a society in which the law of life is concern of all for the good of each and concern of each for the good of all.

It is a society of true democracy, the political system of which ensures effective management of all public affairs, ever more active participation of the working people in running the state, and the combining of citizens' real rights and freedoms with their obligations and responsibility to society.

Developed socialist society is a natural, logical stage on the road to communism.

The supreme goal of the Soviet state is the building of a classless communist society in which there will be public, communist self-government. The main aims of the people's socialist state are: to lay the material and technical foundation of communism, to perfect socialist social relations and transform them into communist relations, to mould the citizen

of communist society, to raise the people's living and cultural standards, to safeguard the country's security, and to further the consolidation of peace and development of international co-operation.

The Soviet people,
guided by the ideas of scientific communism and true to their revolutionary traditions,
relying on the great social, economic, and political gains of socialism,
striving for the further development of socialist democracy,
taking into account the international position of the USSR as part of the world system of socialism, and conscious of their internationalist responsibility,
preserving continuity of the ideas and principles of the first Soviet Constitution of 1918, the Constitution of the USSR and the Constitution of the USSR,
hereby affirm the principles of the social structure and policy of the USSR, and define the rights, freedoms and obligations of citizens, and the principles of the organisation of the socialist state of the whole people, and its aims, and proclaim these in this Constitution.

I. PRINCIPLES OF THE SOCIAL STRUCTURE AND POLICY OF THE USSR

Chapter I

THE POLITICAL SYSTEM

Article 1. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is a socialist state of the whole people, expressing the will and interests of the workers, peasants, and intelligentsia, the working people of all the nations and nationalities of the country.

Article 2. All power in the USSR belongs to the people.

The people exercise state power through Soviets of People's Deputies, which constitute the political foundation of the USSR.

All other state bodies are under the control of, and accountable to, the Soviets of People's Deputies.

Article 3. The Soviet state is organised and functions on the principle of democratic centralism, namely the effectiveness of all bodies of state authority from the lowest to the highest, their accountability to the people, and the obligation of lower bodies to observe the decisions of higher ones. Democratic centralism combines central leadership with local initiative and creative activity and with the responsibility of each state body and official for the work entrusted to them.

Article 4. The Soviet state and all its bodies function on the basis of socialist law, ensure the maintenance of law and order, and safeguard the interests of society and the rights and freedoms of citizens.

State organisations, public organisations and officials shall observe the Constitution of the USSR and Soviet laws.

Article 5. Major matters of state shall be submitted to nationwide discussion and put to a popular vote (referendum).

Article 6. The leading and guiding force of Soviet society and the nucleus of its political system, of all state organisations and public organisations, is the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The CPSU exists for the people and serves the people.

The Communist Party, armed with Marxism-Leninism, determines the general perspectives of the development of

society and the course of the home and foreign policy of the USSR, directs the great constructive work of the Soviet people, and imparts a planned, systematic and theoretically substantiated character to their struggle for the victory of communism.

All party organisations shall function within the framework of the Constitution of the USSR.

Article 7. Trade unions, the All-Union Leninist Young Communist League, co-operatives, and other public organisations, participate, in accordance with the aims laid down in their rules, in managing state and public affairs, and in deciding political, economic, and social and cultural matters.

Article 8. Work collectives take part in discussing and deciding state and public affairs, in planning production and social development, in training and placing personnel, and in discussing and deciding matters pertaining to the management of enterprises and institutions, the improvement of working and living conditions, and the use of funds allocated both for developing production and for social and cultural purposes and financial incentives.

Work collectives promote socialist emulation, the spread of progressive methods of work, and the strengthening of production discipline, educate their members in the spirit of communist morality, and strive to enhance their political consciousness and raise their cultural level and skills and qualifications.

Article 9. The principal direction in the development of the political system of Soviet society is the extension of socialist democracy, namely ever broader participation of citizens in managing the affairs of society and the state, continuous improvement of the machinery of state, heightening of the activity of public organisations, strengthening of the system of people's control, consolidation of the legal foundations of the functioning of the state and of public life, greater openness and publicity, and constant responsiveness to public opinion.

Chapter 2

THE ECONOMIC SYSTEM

Article 10. The foundation of the economic system of the USSR is socialist ownership of the means of production in the form of state property (belonging to all the people), and collective farm-and-co-operative property.

Socialist ownership also embraces the property of trade unions and other public organisations which they require to carry out their purposes under their rules.

The state protects socialist property and provides conditions for its growth.

No one has the right to use socialist property for personal gain or other selfish ends.

Article 11. State property, i.e. the common property of the Soviet people, is the principal form of socialist property.

The land, its minerals, waters, and forests are the exclusive property of the state. The state owns the basic means of production in industry, construction, and agriculture; means of transport and communication; the banks; the property of state-run trade organisations and public utilities, and other state-run undertakings; most urban housing; and other property necessary for state purposes.

Article 12. The property of collective farms and other co-operative organisations, and of their joint undertakings, comprises the means of production and other assets which they require for the purposes laid down in their rules.

The land held by collective farms is secured to them for their free use in perpetuity.

The state promotes development of collective farm-and-co-operative property and its approximation to state property.

Collective farms, like other land users, are obliged to make effective and thrifty use of the land and to increase its fertility.

Article 13. Earned income forms the basis of the personal property of Soviet citizens. The personal property of citizens of the USSR may include articles of everyday use, personal consumption and convenience, the implements and other objects of a small-holding, a house, and earned savings. The

personal property of citizens, and the right to inherit it are protected by the state.

Citizens may be granted the use of plots of land, in the manner prescribed by law, for a subsidiary small-holding (including the keeping of livestock and poultry), for fruit and vegetable growing or for building an individual dwelling. Citizens are required to make rational use of the land allotted to them. The state, and collective farms provide assistance to citizens in working their small-holdings.

Property owned or used by citizens shall not serve as a means of deriving unearned income or be employed to the detriment of the interests of society.

Article 14. The source of the growth of social wealth and of the well-being of the people, and of each individual, is the labour, free from exploitation, of Soviet people.

The state exercises control over the measure of labour and of consumption in accordance with the principle of socialism: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his work". It fixes the rate of taxation on taxable income.

Socially useful work and its results determine a person's status in society. By combining material and moral incentives and encouraging innovation and a creative attitude to work, the state helps transform labour into the prime vital need of every Soviet citizen.

Article 15. The supreme goal of social production under socialism is the fullest possible satisfaction of the people's growing material, and cultural and intellectual requirements.

Relying on the creative initiative of the working people, socialist emulation, and scientific and technological progress, and by improving the forms and methods of economic management, the state ensures growth of the productivity of labour, raising of the efficiency of production and of the quality of work, and dynamic, planned, proportionate development of the economy.

Article 16. The economy of the USSR is an integral economic complex comprising all the elements of social production, distribution, and exchange on its territory.

The economy is managed on the basis of state plans for economic and social development, with due account of the

sectoral and territorial principles, and by combining centralised direction with the managerial independence and initiative of individual and amalgamated enterprises and other organisations, for which active use is made of management accounting, profit, cost, and other economic levers and incentives.

Article 17. In the USSR, the law permits individual labour in handicrafts, farming, the provision of services for the public, and other forms of activity based exclusively on the personal work of individual citizens and members of their families. The state makes regulations for such work to ensure that it serves the interest of society.

Article 18. In the interests of the present and future generations, the necessary steps are taken in the USSR to protect and make scientific, rational use of the land and its mineral and water resources, and the plant and animal kingdoms, to preserve the purity of air and water, ensure reproduction of natural wealth, and improve the human environment.

Chapter 3

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT AND CULTURE

Article 19. The social basis of the USSR is the unbreakable alliance of the workers, peasants, and intelligentsia.

The state helps enhance the social homogeneity of society, namely the elimination of class differences and of the essential distinctions between town and country and between mental and physical labour, and the all-round development and drawing together of all the nations and nationalities of the USSR.

Article 20. In accordance with the communist ideal—"The free development of each is the condition of the free development of all"—the state pursues the aim of giving citizens more and more real opportunities to apply their creative energies, abilities, and talents, and to develop their personalities in every way.

Article 21. The state concerns itself with improving working conditions, safety and labour protection and the scientific organisation of work, and with reducing and ultimately

eliminating all arduous physical labour through comprehensive mechanisation and automation of production processes in all branches of the economy.

Article 22. A programme is being consistently implemented in the USSR to convert agricultural work into a variety of industrial work, to extend the network of educational, cultural and medical institutions, and of trade, public catering, service and public utility facilities in rural localities, and transform hamlets and villages into well-planned and well-appointed settlements.

Article 23. The state pursues a steady policy of raising people's pay levels and real incomes through increase in productivity.

In order to satisfy the needs of Soviet people more fully social consumption funds are created. The state, with the broad participation of public organisations and work collectives, ensures the growth and just distribution of these funds.

Article 24. In the USSR, state systems of health protection, social security, trade and public catering, communal services and amenities, and public utilities, operate and are being extended.

The state encourages co-operatives and other public organisations to provide all types of services for the population. It encourages the development of mass physical culture and sport.

Article 25. In the USSR there is a uniform system of public education, which is being constantly improved, that provides general education and vocational training for citizens, serves the communist education and intellectual and physical development of the youth, and trains them for work and social activity.

Article 26. In accordance with society's needs the state provides for planned development of science and the training of scientific personnel and organises introduction of the results of research in the economy and other spheres of life.

Article 27. The state concerns itself with protecting, augmenting and making extensive use of society's cultural wealth for the moral and aesthetic education of the Soviet people, for raising their cultural level.

In the USSR development of the professional, amateur and folk arts is encouraged in every way.

Chapter 4

FOREIGN POLICY

Article 28. The USSR steadfastly pursues a Leninist policy of peace and stands for strengthening of the security of nations and broad international co-operation.

The foreign policy of the USSR is aimed at ensuring international conditions favourable for building communism in the USSR, safeguarding the state interests of the Soviet Union, consolidating the positions of world socialism, supporting the struggle of peoples for national liberation and social progress, preventing wars of aggression, achieving universal and complete disarmament, and consistently implementing the principle of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems.

In the USSR war propaganda is banned.

Article 29. The USSR's relations with other states are based on observance of the following principles: sovereign equality; mutual renunciation of the use or threat of force; inviolability of frontiers; territorial integrity of states; peaceful settlement of disputes; non-intervention in internal affairs; respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms; the equal rights of peoples and their right to decide their own destiny; co-operation among states; and fulfilment in good faith of obligations arising from the generally recognised principles and rules of international law, and from the international treaties signed by the USSR.

Article 30. The USSR, as part of the world system of socialism and of the socialist community, promotes and strengthens friendship, co-operation, and comradely mutual assistance with other socialist countries on the basis of the principle of socialist internationalism, and takes an active part in socialist economic integration and the socialist international division of labour.

Chapter 5

DEFENCE OF THE SOCIALIST MOTHERLAND

Article 31. Defence of the Socialist Motherland is one of the most important functions of the state, and is the concern of the whole people.

In order to defend the gains of socialism, the peaceful labour of the Soviet people, and the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the state, the USSR maintains armed forces and has instituted universal military service.

The duty of the Armed Forces of the USSR to the people is to provide reliable defence of the Socialist Motherland and to be in constant combat readiness, guaranteeing that any aggressor is instantly repulsed.

Article 32. The state ensures the security and defence capability of the country, and supplies the Armed Forces of the USSR with everything necessary for that purpose.

The duties of state bodies, public organisations, officials, and citizens in regard to safeguarding the country's security and strengthening its defence capacity are defined by the legislation of the USSR.

II. THE STATE AND THE INDIVIDUAL

Chapter 6

CITIZENSHIP OF THE USSR EQUALITY OF CITIZENS' RIGHTS

Article 33. Uniform federal citizenship is established for the USSR. Every citizen of a Union Republic is a citizen of the USSR.

The grounds and procedure for acquiring or forfeiting Soviet citizenship are defined by the Law on Citizenship of the USSR.

When abroad, citizens of the USSR enjoy the protection and assistance of the Soviet state.

Article 34. Citizens of the USSR are equal before the law, without distinction of origin, social or property status, race or nationality, sex, education, language, attitude to religion, type and nature of occupation, domicile, or other status.

The equal rights of citizens of the USSR are guaranteed in all fields of economic, political, social, and cultural life.

Article 35. Women and men have equal rights in the USSR.

Exercise of these rights is ensured by according women equal access with men to education and vocational and professional training, equal opportunities in employment, remuneration, and promotion, and in social and political, and

cultural activity, and by special labour and health protection measures for women; by providing conditions enabling mothers to work; by legal protection, and material and moral support for mothers and children, including paid leaves and other benefits for expectant mothers and mothers, and gradual reduction of working time for mothers with small children.

Article 36. Citizens of the USSR of different races and nationalities have equal rights.

Exercise of these rights is ensured by a policy of all-round development and drawing together of all the nations and nationalities of the USSR, by educating citizens in the spirit of Soviet patriotism and socialist internationalism, and by the possibility to use their native language and the languages of other peoples of the USSR.

Any direct or indirect limitation of the rights of citizens or establishment of direct or indirect privileges on grounds of race or nationality, and any advocacy of racial or national exclusiveness, hostility or contempt, are punishable by law.

Article 37. Citizens of other countries and stateless persons in the USSR are guaranteed the rights and freedoms provided by law, including the right to apply to a court and other state bodies for the protection of their personal, property, family, and other rights.

Citizens of other countries and stateless persons, when in the USSR, are obliged to respect the Constitution of the USSR and observe Soviet laws.

Article 48. The USSR grants the right of asylum to foreigners persecuted for defending the interests of the working people and the cause of peace, or for participation in the revolutionary and national-liberation movement, or for progressive social and political, scientific or other creative activity.

Chapter 7

THE BASIC RIGHTS, FREEDOMS, AND DUTIES OF CITIZENS OF THE USSR

Article 39. Citizens of the USSR enjoy in full the social, economic, political and personal rights and freedoms proclaimed and guaranteed by the Constitution of the USSR and

by Soviet laws. The socialist system ensures enlargement of the rights and freedoms of citizens and continuous improvement of their living standards as social, economic, and cultural development programmes are fulfilled.

Enjoyment by citizens of their rights and freedoms must not be to the detriment of the interests of society or the state, or infringe the rights of other citizens.

Article 40. Citizens of the USSR have the right to work (that is, to guaranteed employment and pay in accordance with the quantity and quality of their work, and not below the state-established minimum), including the right to choose their trade or profession, type of job and work in accordance with their inclinations, abilities, training and education, with due account of the needs of society.

This right is ensured by the socialist economic system, steady growth of the productive forces, free vocational and professional training, improvement of skills, training in new trades or professions, and development of the systems of vocational guidance and job placement.

Article 41. Citizens of the USSR have the right to rest and leisure.

This right is ensured by the establishment of a working week not exceeding 41 hours, for workers and other employees, a shorter working day in a number of trades and industries, and shorter hours for night work; by the provision of paid annual holidays, weekly days of rest, extension of the network of cultural, educational and health-building institutions, and the development on a mass scale of sport, physical culture, and camping and tourism; by the provision of neighbourhood recreational facilities, and of other opportunities for rational use of free time.

The length of collective farmers' working and leisure time is established by their collective farms.

Article 42. Citizens of the USSR have the right to health protection.

This right is ensured by free, qualified medical care provided by state health institutions; by extension of the network of therapeutic and health-building institutions; by the development and improvement of safety and hygiene in industry; by carrying out broad prophylactic measures; by measures to improve the environment; by special care for the

health of the rising generation, including prohibition of child labour, excluding the work done by children as part of the school curriculum; and by developing research to prevent and reduce the incidence of disease and ensure citizens a long and active life.

Article 43. Citizens of the USSR have the right to maintenance in old age, in sickness, and in the event of complete or partial disability or loss of the breadwinner.

This right is guaranteed by social insurance of workers and other employees and collective farmers; by allowances for temporary disability; by the provision by the state or by collective farms of retirement pensions, disability pensions, and pensions for loss of the breadwinner; by providing employment for the partially disabled; by care for the elderly and the disabled; and by other forms of social security.

Article 44. Citizens of the USSR have the right to housing.

This right is ensured by the development and upkeep of state and socially-owned housing; by assistance for co-operative and individual house building; by fair distribution, under public control, of the housing that becomes available through fulfilment of the programme of building well-appointed dwellings, and by low rents and low charges for utility services. Citizens of the USSR shall take good care of the housing allocated to them.

Article 45. Citizens of the USSR have the right to education.

This right is ensured by free provision of all forms of education, by the institution of universal, compulsory secondary education, and broad development of vocational, specialised secondary, and higher education, in which instruction is oriented toward practical activity and production; by the development of extramural, correspondence and evening courses; by the provision of state scholarships and grants and privileges for students; by the free issue of school textbooks; by the opportunity to attend a school where teaching is in the native language; and by the provision of facilities for self-education.

Article 46. Citizens of the USSR have the right to enjoy cultural benefits.

This right is ensured by broad access to the cultural treasures of their own land and of the world that are

preserved in state and other public collections; by the development and fair distribution of cultural and educational institutions throughout the country; by developing television and radio broadcasting and the publishing of books, newspapers and periodicals, and by extending the free library service; and by expanding cultural exchanges with other countries.

Article 47. Citizens of the USSR, in accordance with the aims of building communism, are guaranteed freedoms of scientific, technical, and artistic work. This freedom is ensured by broadening scientific research, encouraging invention and innovation, and developing literature and the arts. The state provides the necessary material conditions for this and support for voluntary societies and unions of workers in the arts, organises introduction of inventions and innovations in production and other spheres of activity.

The rights of authors, inventors and innovators are protected by the state.

Article 48. Citizens of the USSR have the right to take part in the management and administration of state and public affairs and in the discussion and adoption of laws and measures of All-Union and local significance.

This right is ensured by the opportunity to vote and to be elected to Soviets of People's Deputies and other elective state bodies, to take part in nationwide discussions and referendums, in people's control, in the work of state bodies, public organisations, and local community groups, and in meetings at places of work or residence.

Article 49. Every citizen of the USSR has the right to submit proposals to state bodies and public organisations for improving their activity, and to criticise shortcomings in their work.

Officials are obliged, within established time-limits, to examine citizens' proposals and requests, to reply to them, and to take appropriate action.

Persecution for criticism is prohibited. Persons guilty of such persecution shall be called to account.

Article 50. In accordance with the interests of the people and in order to strengthen and develop the socialist system, citizens of the USSR are guaranteed freedom of speech, of the press, and of assembly, meetings, street processions and demonstrations.

Exercise of these political freedoms is ensured by putting public buildings, streets and squares at the disposal of the working people and their organisations, by broad dissemination of information, and by the opportunity to use the press, television, and radio.

Article 51. In accordance with the aims of building communism, citizens of the USSR have the right to associate in public organisations that promote their political activity and initiative and satisfaction of their various interests.

Public organisations are guaranteed conditions for successfully performing the functions defined in their rules.

Article 52. Citizens of the USSR are guaranteed freedom of conscience, that is, the right to profess or not to profess any religion, and to conduct religious worship or atheistic propaganda. Incitement of hostility or hatred on religious grounds is prohibited.

In the USSR, the church is separated from the state, and the school from the church.

Article 53. The family enjoys the protection of the state.

Marriage is based on the free consent of the woman and the man; the spouses are completely equal in their family relations.

The state helps the family by providing and developing a broad system of childcare institutions, by organising and improving communal services and public catering, by paying grants on the birth of a child, by providing children's allowances and benefits for large families, and other forms of family allowances and assistance.

Article 54. Citizens of the USSR are guaranteed inviolability of the person. No one may be arrested except by a court decision or on the warrant of a procurator.

Article 55. Citizens of the USSR are guaranteed inviolability of the home. No one may, without lawful grounds, enter a home against the will of those residing in it.

Article 56. The privacy of citizens, and of their correspondence, telephone conversations, and telegraphic communications is protected by law.

Article 57. Respect for the individual and protection of the rights and freedoms of citizens are the duty of all state bodies, public organisations, and officials.

Citizens of the USSR have the right to protection by the

courts against encroachments on their honour and reputation, life and health, and personal freedom and property.

Article 58. Citizens of the USSR have the right to lodge a complaint against the actions of officials, state bodies and public bodies. Complaints shall be examined according to the procedure and within the time-limit established by law.

Actions by officials that contravene the law or exceed their powers, and infringe the rights of citizens, may be appealed against in a court in the manner prescribed by law.

Citizens of the USSR have the right to compensation for damage resulting from unlawful actions by state organisations and public organisations, or by officials in the performance of their duties.

Article 59. Citizens' exercise of their rights and freedoms is inseparable from the performance of their duties and obligations.

Citizens of the USSR are obliged to observe the Constitution of the USSR and Soviet laws, comply with the standards of socialist conduct, and uphold the honour and dignity of Soviet citizenship.

Article 60. It is the duty of, and a matter of honour for, every able-bodied citizen of the USSR to work conscientiously in his chosen, socially useful occupation, and strictly to observe labour discipline. Evasion of socially useful work is incompatible with the principles of socialist society.

Article 61. Citizens of the USSR are obliged to preserve and protect socialist property. It is the duty of a citizen of the USSR to combat misappropriation and squandering of state and socially-owned property and to make thrifty use of the people's wealth.

Persons encroaching in any way on socialist property shall be punished according to the law.

Article 62. Citizens of the USSR are obliged to safeguard the interests of the Soviet state, and to enhance its power and prestige.

Defence of the Socialist Motherland is the sacred duty of every citizen of the USSR.

Betrayal of the Motherland is the gravest of crimes against the people.

Article 63. Military service in the ranks of the Armed Forces of the USSR is an honourable duty of Soviet citizens.

Article 64. It is the duty of every citizen of the USSR to respect the national dignity of other citizens, and to strengthen friendship of the nations and nationalities of the multinational Soviet state.

Article 65. A citizen of the USSR is obliged to respect the rights and lawful interests of other persons, to be uncompromising toward anti-social behaviour, and to help maintain public order.

Article 66. Citizens of the USSR are obliged to concern themselves with the upbringing of children, to train them for socially useful work, and to raise them as worthy members of socialist society. Children are obliged to care for their parents and help them.

Article 67. Citizens of the USSR are obliged to protect nature and conserve its riches.

Article 68. Concern for the preservation of historical monuments and other cultural values is a duty and obligation of citizens of the USSR.

Article 69. It is the internationalist duty of citizens of the USSR to promote friendship and co-operation with peoples of other lands and help maintain and strengthen world peace.

III. THE NATIONAL-STATE STRUCTURE OF THE USSR

Chapter 8

THE USSR—A FEDERAL STATE

Article 70. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is an integral, federal, multinational state formed on the principle of socialist federalism as a result of the free self-determination of nations and the voluntary association of equal Soviet Socialist Republics.

The USSR embodies the state unity of the Soviet people and draws all its nations and nationalities together for the purpose of jointly building communism.

Article 71. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics unites:
the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic,
the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic,
the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic,

the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic,
the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic,
the Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic,
the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic,
the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic,
the Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic,
the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic,
the Kirghiz Soviet Socialist Republic,
the Tajik Soviet Socialist Republic,
the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic,
the Turkmen Soviet Socialist Republic,
the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Article 72. Each Union Republic shall retain the right freely to secede from the USSR.

Article 73. The jurisdiction of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, as represented by its highest bodies of state authority and administration, shall cover:

1. the admission of new republics to the USSR; endorsement of the formation of new autonomous republics and autonomous regions within Union Republics;
2. determination of the state boundaries of the USSR and approval of changes in the boundaries between Union Republics;
3. establishment of the general principles for the organisation and functioning of republican and local bodies of state authority and administration;
4. the ensurance of uniformity of legislative norms throughout the USSR and establishment of the fundamentals of the legislation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Union Republics;
5. pursuance of a uniform social and economic policy; direction the country's economy; determination of the main lines of scientific and technological progress and the general measures for rational exploitation and conservation of natural resources; the drafting and approval of state plans for the economic and social development of the USSR, and endorsement of reports on their fulfilment;
6. the drafting and approval of the consolidated Budget of the USSR, and endorsement of the report on its execution; management of a single monetary and credit system; determination of the taxes and revenues forming the Budget of the

USSR; and the formulation of prices and wages policy;

7. direction of the sectors of the economy, and of enterprises and amalgamations under Union jurisdiction, and general direction of industries under Union-Republican jurisdiction;

8. issues of war and peace, defence of the sovereignty of the USSR and safeguarding of its frontiers and territory, and organisation of defence; direction of the Armed Forces of the USSR;

9. state security;

10. representation of the USSR in international relations; the USSR's relations with other states and with international organisations; establishment of the general procedure for, and co-ordination of, the relations of Union Republics with other states and with international organisations; foreign trade and other forms of external economic activity on the basis of state monopoly;

11. control over observance of the Constitution of the USSR, and ensurance of conformity of the Constitutions of Union Republics to the Constitution of the USSR;

12. and settlement of other matters of All-Union importance.

Article 74. The laws of the USSR shall have the same force in all Union Republics. In the event of a discrepancy between a Union Republic law and an All-Union law, the law of the USSR shall prevail.

Article 75. The territory of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is a single entity and comprises the territories of the Union Republics.

The sovereignty of the USSR extends throughout its territory.

IV. SOVIETS OF PEOPLE'S DEPUTIES AND ELECTORAL PROCEDURE

Chapter 12

THE SYSTEM OF SOVIETS OF PEOPLE'S DEPUTIES AND THE PRINCIPLES OF THEIR WORK

Article 89. The Soviets of People's Deputies, i.e. the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, the Supreme Soviets of Union

Republics, the Supreme Soviets of Autonomous Republics, the Soviets of People's Deputies of Territories and Regions, the Soviets of People's Deputies of Autonomous Regions and Autonomous Areas, and the Soviets of People's Deputies of districts, cities, city districts, settlements and villages shall constitute a single system of bodies of state authority.

Article 90. The term of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, the Supreme Soviets of Union Republics, and the Supreme Soviets of Autonomous Republics shall be five years.

The term of local Soviets of People's Deputies shall be two and a half years.

Elections to Soviets of People's Deputies shall be called not later than two months before the expiry of the term of the Soviet concerned.

Article 91. The most important matters within the jurisdiction of the respective Soviets of People's Deputies shall be considered and settled at their sessions.

Soviets of People's Deputies shall elect standing commissions and form executive-administrative, and other bodies accountable to them.

Article 92. Soviets of People's Deputies shall form people's control bodies combining state control with control by the working people at enterprises, collective farms, institutions, and organisations.

People's control bodies shall check on the fulfilment of state plans and assignments, combat breaches of state discipline, localistic tendencies, narrow departmental attitudes, mismanagement, extravagance and waste, red tape and bureaucracy, and help improve the working of the state machinery.

Article 93. Soviets of People's Deputies shall direct all sectors of state, economic, and social and cultural development, either directly or through bodies instituted by them, take decisions and ensure their execution, and verify their implementation.

Article 94. Soviets of People's Deputies shall function publicly on the basis of collective, free, constructive discussion and decision-making, of systematic reporting back to them and the people by their executive-administrative and other bodies, and of involving citizens on a broad scale in their work.

Soviets of People's Deputies and the bodies set up by them shall systematically inform the public about their work and the decisions taken by them.

Chapter 13

THE ELECTORAL SYSTEM

Article 95. Deputies to all Soviets shall be elected on the basis of universal, equal, and direct suffrage by secret ballot.

Article 96. Elections shall be universal: all citizens of the USSR who have reached the age of 18 shall have the right to vote and to be elected, with the exception of persons who have been legally certified insane.

To be eligible for election to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR a citizen of the USSR must have reached the age of 21.

Article 97. Elections shall be equal: each citizen shall have one vote; all voters shall exercise the franchise on an equal footing.

Article 98. Elections shall be direct: deputies to all Soviets of People's Deputies shall be elected by citizens by direct vote.

Article 99. Voting at elections shall be secret: control over voters' exercise of the franchise is inadmissible.

Article 100. The following shall have the right to nominate candidates: branches and organisations of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, trade unions, and the All-Union Leninist Young Communist League; co-operatives and other public organisations; work collectives, and meetings of servicemen in their military units.

Citizens of the USSR and public organisations are guaranteed the right to free and all-round discussion of the political and personal qualities and competence of candidates, and the right to campaign for them at meetings, in the press, and on television and radio.

The expenses involved in holding elections to Soviets of People's Deputies shall be met by the state.

Article 101. Deputies to Soviets of People's Deputies shall be elected by constituencies.

A citizen of the USSR may not, as a rule, be elected to more than two Soviets of People's Deputies.

Elections to the Soviets shall be conducted by electoral commissions consisting of representatives of public organisations and work collectives, and of meetings of servicemen in military units.

The procedure for holding elections to Soviets of People's Deputies shall be defined by the laws of the USSR and of Union and Autonomous Republics.

Article 102. Electors give mandates to their Deputies.

The appropriate Soviets of People's Deputies shall examine electors' mandates, take them into account in drafting economic and social development plans and in drawing up the budget, organise implementation of the mandates, and inform citizens about it.

many threads. They are linked at all levels—from republics, territories and regions, down to districts and large enterprises. The cooperation between state bodies, public organisations, and production collectives has grown lively and fruitful.

Spiritual contacts, close links in the fields of ideology and culture have become standard practice.

Relations between states have been called international since olden days. But it is only in our time, in the socialist world that they have truly become relations between nations. Millions upon millions of people take an immediate part in them. That, comrades, is a fundamental gain of socialism, and its great service to humanity.

The range of our cooperation extends to more and more spheres. One example is the Intercosmos programme. Cosmonauts of the fraternal countries are not working for science and the national economy alone. They are also performing a tremendously important political mission.

So allow me, from this rostrum, to extend cordial greetings to the space heroes, those brave sons of the socialist countries.

The constitutions of most fraternal countries emphasise the ideas of friendship and cooperation with the Soviet Union. This is a token of deep confidence in our country, and we reciprocate in kind. The new Constitution of the USSR declares friendship, cooperation, and mutual assistance with other socialist countries the cornerstone of Soviet foreign policy.

The period under review has convincingly shown the highly influential and beneficial effect of the activity of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation, notably its Political Consultative Committee, on European affairs and, for that matter, on world affairs as a whole. Having earlier paved the way to the European Conference, the highest political body of our Treaty has at its sittings in Bucharest, Moscow, and Warsaw come forward with a number of new initiatives which attracted wide attention all over the world. Their main purpose is to defend detente, to give it an energetic rhythm or, as they say, its second wind.

A new body, the Committee of Foreign Ministers, has been set up in these years to further our cooperation. And it is already safe to say that this was completely justified: the

coordination of foreign policy actions has become more prompt.

The development of the Joint Armed Forces has proceeded without a hitch. Here, as always, good work was done by the Committee of Defence Ministers.

The Central Committee reports to the Congress that the defensive political and military alliance of the socialist countries is faithfully serving the cause of peace. It has all the requisites reliably to defend the socialist gains of our peoples. And we will do everything for this to be so in the future.

Far be it from us, comrades, to paint the picture of the present-day socialist world in exclusively radiant colours. Complications, too, occur in the development of our countries. The passage to intensive economic development and large-scale social programmes, and the moulding of the communist consciousness—all this cannot be achieved overnight. It takes time and tireless creative search. And, of course, it is essential to learn from each other.

During the years of building socialism the fraternal countries gained diverse positive experience in organising production and management and in resolving economic problems.

For example, we know how skilfully the work of agricultural cooperatives and enterprises is organised in Hungary and what valuable experience the GDR has gained in rationalising production and saving energy and raw and other materials. There are many interesting and valuable points in the social security system of Czechoslovakia, while Bulgaria and some other European socialist countries have found useful forms of agro-industrial cooperation.

So, comrades, let us study the experience of the fraternal countries more closely and utilise it more broadly.

As we know, the decisive sector of the competition with capitalism is the economy and economic policy. At our past congress, we, like the other fraternal parties, set the task of further extending socialist integration on the basis of long-term special-purpose programmes as a top priority. These programmes are to help us resolve the most acute, vitally important economic problems.

At present, they are being translated into concrete deeds. Integration is gathering momentum. The fruits of specialisation in production are visible in practically all branches of

economy, science, and technology. We now have some 120 multilateral and more than 1,000 bilateral agreements to this effect. Coordination of the economic plans of the CMEA countries for 1981-1985 is nearing completion.

Speaking of the success of joint work, we mention with legitimate pride such large-scale projects as the nearly 3,000-kilometre-long Soyuz gas pipeline, the Mir power grid, to which new transmission lines have been added, the Ust-Ilimsk pulp and paper plant, the Erdenet ore dressing works in Mongolia, the nickel plants in Cuba, and many other newly completed projects. And before us are still greater undertakings for the good of all our community.

What the socialist countries have accomplished in economic development and in raising the living standard of people amounts to a whole era.

The past few years have not been among the most favourable for the national economies of some socialist states. Still, in the past ten years the economic growth rates of the CMEA countries have been twice those of the developed capitalist countries. The CMEA members continued to be the most dynamically developing group of countries in the world.

The CPSU and the other fraternal parties are setting their course on making the coming two five-year periods a time of intensive cooperation among the socialist countries in production, science and technology.

Life is setting us the task of supplementing coordination of our plans with coordination of economic policy as a whole. Also being put on the order of the day are such issues as aligning the structures of economic mechanisms, further extending direct ties between ministries, amalgamations, and enterprises participating in cooperation, and establishing joint firms. Other ways of combining our efforts and resources are also possible.

As you see, comrades, there are many new major problems. Perhaps it would be useful for the leaders of the fraternal countries to discuss them collectively in the near future.

It stands to reason that, like our socialist partners, the Soviet Union wants our ties to be mutually beneficial in all respects.

The Soviet Union receives many types of machinery and equipment, transport vehicles, consumer goods, and certain

raw materials from the fraternal countries. For its part, it supplies the socialist market with oil, gas, ore, cotton, timber, and, of course, a variety of industrial products. In the past five years we received 90,000 million roubles worth of goods from the CMEA countries, while our deliveries totalled 98,000 million.

Nowadays, the steady development of any socialist country, and successful solution by it of such problems as, say, the provision of energy and raw materials and utilisation of the latest scientific and technical achievements, are inconceivable without ties with other fraternal countries.

The problems that arise in the process of our cooperation are being solved jointly, and we jointly seek the most correct ways of harmonising the interests of each fraternal country with the common interest. This applies, among other things, to fixing reduced prices for oil, gas, and other primary and manufactured goods supplied to each other by the countries of CMEA...

All of us have a stake in the socialist market being able to meet the rising needs of the countries of our community. And the benefit of augmenting each other's economic potential is certainly not confined to the purely commercial field. This task calls for a responsible approach by economic executives and Party workers, and for a profound understanding of the fraternal countries' indissoluble community of interests.

We are also in favour of expanding commercial and economic relations with the West. That, by the way, is a factor that stabilises international relations. But here we are compelled to take account of the policy of the capitalist states. Not infrequently they try to use economic ties with us as a means of political pressure. Is this not made clear by all sorts of bans and discriminatory restrictions on trade with various socialist countries.

It should be noted in general that in recent years our countries have had to deal with their constructive tasks in more complicated conditions. The deterioration of the world economic situation and spiralling prices have played their part. The slowing down of the process of detente and the arms race imposed by the imperialist powers are no small a burden for us as well.

Another thing is the visible sharpening of the ideological

struggle. For the West it is not confined to the battle of ideas. It employs a whole system of means designed to subvert or soften up the socialist world.

The imperialists and their accomplices are systematically conducting hostile campaigns against the socialist countries. They malign and distort everything that goes on in them. For them the main thing is to turn people against socialism...

The history of world socialism has seen all sorts of trials. There were difficult times and critical situations. But Communists have always courageously faced the attacks of the adversary, and have invariably won. That's how it was, and that's how it will be. And let no one doubt our common determination to secure our interests and to defend the socialist gains of the peoples.

We are fighting for the just cause of peace and the security of nations, and for the interests of the working people. We have on our side the truth of the Marxist-Leninist teaching. Our strength is in unity and cohesion.

It was said at the past congress that a process of convergence of the socialist states was taking place. That process is continuing. But it does not obliterate the specific national features or the historical distinctions of the socialist countries. We should see the variety of forms in their social life and economic organisation for what it really is—a wealth of ways and methods of establishing the socialist way of life.

Our relations with the socialist countries that are not in the Warsaw Treaty or CMEA are also developing.

2. DEVELOPMENT OF RELATIONS WITH THE NEWLY-FREE COUNTRIES

Comrades, among the important results of the Party's international activity in the period under review we can list the visible expansion of cooperation with countries that have liberated themselves from colonial oppression.

These countries are very different. After liberation, some of them have been following the revolutionary-democratic path. In others capitalist relations have taken root. Some of them are following a truly independent policy, while others are today taking their lead from imperialist policy. In a nutshell, the picture is a fairly motley one.

Let me first deal with the socialist-oriented states, that is, states that have opted for socialist development. Their number has increased. Development along the progressive road is not, of course, the same from country to country, and proceeds in difficult conditions. But the main lines are similar. These include gradual elimination of the positions of imperialist monopoly, of the local big bourgeoisie and the feudal elements, and restriction of foreign capital. They include the securing by the people's state of commanding heights in the economy and transition to planned development of the productive forces, and encouragement of the cooperative movement in the countryside. They include enhancing the role of the working masses in social life, and gradually reinforcing the state apparatus with national personnel faithful to the people. They include anti-imperialist foreign policy. Revolutionary parties expressing the interests of the broad mass of the working people are growing stronger there....

In the mid-seventies the former colonial countries raised the question of a new international economic order. Restructuring international economic relations on a democratic foundation, along lines of equality, is natural from the point of view of history. Much can and must be done in this respect. And, certainly, the issue must not be reduced, as this is sometimes done, simply to distinctions between "rich North" and "poor South". We are prepared to contribute, and are indeed contributing, to the establishment of equitable international economic relations.

No one should have any doubts, comrades, that *the CPSU will consistently continue the policy of promoting cooperation between the USSR and the newly-free countries, and consolidating the alliance of world socialism and the national liberation movement.*

3. THE CPSU AND THE WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

Now about the line of the CPSU in the world communist and working-class movement.

The international working class and its political vanguard—the Communist and Workers' parties—approached the eighties with confidence. They approached them as active

fighters for the rights of the working people, and for peace and the security of nations.

The communist movement continued to expand its ranks, and to win increasing influence among the masses. Today, Communist parties are active in 94 countries. In Western Europe alone, some 800,000 new fighters have joined their ranks in the past ten years. Is this not evidence of the indomitable force of attraction of communist ideas?

Our Party and its Central Committee have worked actively for the further expansion and deepening of all-round cooperation with the fraternal parties. During the period under review, members and alternate members of the Political Bureau and secretaries of the Central Committee alone have received several hundred delegations from other parties. In their turn, representatives of the CPSU participated in the work of Communist party congresses and other party functions abroad.

We have regularly briefed fraternal parties on our internal developments and our actions in the field of foreign policy. Comrades from abroad have had extensive opportunities to acquaint themselves with the practical activity of the CPSU at local level—in the republics and regions of the Soviet Union, and at enterprises. All this, as our friends attest, is helping them in their work.

Contacts with foreign Communists enable our Party, too, to get a better idea of the situation in individual countries.

As the influence of the Communist parties grows, the tasks facing them are becoming more and more complex and diverse. And sometimes that gives rise to divergent appraisals and differences in approach to concrete issues of the class struggle, and to discussions between parties.

As we see it, this is completely natural. Communist parties have had dissimilar opinions on some issues in the past as well. The facts have proved convincingly that even in the presence of differences of opinion it is possible and necessary to cooperate politically in the fight against the common class enemy. The supreme arbiter in resolving problems is time and practice. Lenin was absolutely right when he said that many differences "can, and unfailingly will, vanish; this will result from the logic of the joint struggle against the really

formidable enemy, the bourgeoisie..." (*Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 89).

Some time ago the leaderships of a few Communist parties began to vigorously defend the right to specifically national ways and forms of struggle for socialism and of building socialism. But if you look at this without prejudice, you will see that no one is imposing any stereotypes or patterns that ignore the distinctions of any country.

Lenin's attitude on this score is well known. "All nations," he wrote, "will arrive at socialism—this is inevitable, but all will do so in not exactly the same way, each will contribute something of its own to some form of democracy, to some variety of the dictatorship of the proletariat, to the varying rate of socialist transformations in the different aspects of social life" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 23, pp. 69-70).

Our Party has never departed from Lenin's principle, which has by now been thoroughly corroborated by the facts of history. Consider this, comrades. In none of the now existing socialist countries have the forms, methods, and ways of the socialist revolution been a mechanical repetition of outside experience. Take the GDR or Poland, Hungary or Cuba, Mongolia or Yugoslavia—all the socialist countries, in fact, carried out the revolution in their own way, using forms that were dictated by the correlation of class forces in each of these countries, by the national distinctions and the external situation.

There had been armed struggle and peaceful forms of passage to the new social system; there had been rapid coming to power of the labouring classes and processes that had dragged out in time. In some countries the revolution had to defend itself against foreign intervention, others had been spared any outside invasions.

The establishment and consolidation of socialist foundations and the building of socialist society, as I have already said, also had and still have distinctive features in different countries.

So, as I see it, unless one ignores the actual facts, one cannot speak of any "uniformity" or contrast Communist parties according to the criterion of recognising or not recognising the ways they choose to reconstruct society.

Critical judgements of separate concrete aspects of develop-

ment in our country are sometimes voiced in some Communist parties. Far be it from us to think that everything we had was ideal. In the USSR, socialism was built in incredibly difficult conditions. The Party hewed its way through virgin land. And nobody knows better than we do what difficulties and shortcomings occurred along the way, and which of them have still to be overcome.

We pay close heed to comradely, constructive criticism. But we are categorically opposed to "criticism" which distorts the socialist reality and, wittingly or unwittingly, does a good turn thereby to imperialist propaganda, to our class opponent.

As our Party sees it, differences of opinion between Communists can be overcome, unless, of course, they are fundamental differences between revolutionaries and reformists, between creative Marxism and dogmatic sectarianism or ultra-Left adventurism. In that case, of course, there can be no compromises—today just as in Lenin's lifetime. But when Communists fight for the common revolutionary cause, we believe that patient comradely discussion of differing views and positions serves their common aims best of all.

The great unifying principle, a powerful factor furthering cohesion and enhancing the prestige of the world communist movement, is the Communists' unremitting struggle for peace, against imperialism's aggressive policy, and the arms race that carries with it the danger of a nuclear disaster.

The main thing is that Communists, armed with the Marxist-Leninist teaching, see the essence and perspective of the processes in the world more profoundly and more correctly than anybody else, and draw the right conclusions from them for their struggle for the interests of the working class, the working people of their countries, and for democracy, peace and socialism.

That is the foundation on which the CPSU builds its relations with the fraternal parties. We have good friendly relations with the vast majority of Communist parties....

CPSU cooperation with other democratic forces has grown closer during the period under review. Further advances were registered, in particular, in our ties with the socialist and social-democratic parties of Finland, Belgium, Sweden, Japan, Spain, and a number of other countries—and this chiefly on questions of struggle against the war danger. Of high

importance here were our contacts with the leadership of the Socialist International, our participation in the Socialist International's conference on disarmament, the contacts we had with its study group on disarmament, and the reception of its delegation at the CPSU Central Committee.

Present-day social democracy has considerable political weight. It could do more for the defence of the vital interests of the peoples and, above all, for the consolidation of peace, for improving the international situation, repulsing fascism and racism, and the offensive of reactionary forces on the political rights of the working people. In practice, however, the social-democratic leaders do not always act along these lines.

Many of them are afflicted with the virus of anticomunism. Some allow themselves to be drawn into campaigns organised by imperialism against the socialist countries, and refer to the so-called Atlantic solidarity to justify the arms race. Understandably, this policy is contrary to the interests of the working people. We disapprove of it most strongly.

But we will actively support all steps that are beneficial to peace and democracy. In view of the present complication of the international situation, we attach importance to cooperation with Social Democrats, trade unions, religious circles, and all democratic and peaceloving forces in the matter of preventing war and strengthening peace. Last year's World Parliament of the Peoples for Peace in Sofia was a good example of such cooperation.

Soviet Communists welcome the achievements of the Communist parties in expanding their ranks, tightening their links with the masses, defending the interests and democratic rights and freedoms of the working class and all the working people, and in the struggle to curb the omnipotence of monopoly, to check the spread of militarism, and for the socialist perspective in their countries.

Comrades, despite terror and persecution, despite prison and the barbed wire of concentration camps, in selfless and often very difficult everyday work for the good of the peoples, Communists in the capitalist countries remain loyal to the ideals of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

We express our deep-felt solidarity with our Communist

brothers languishing in the dungeons of fascist dictatorships, with those persecuted by the police or fighting their hard battles underground. We express our solidarity with those subjected to discrimination and deprived of civil and political rights merely for their convictions, for belonging to the party of the working class.

Honour and glory to Communists, courageous fighters for the people's cause!

4. RELATIONS WITH THE CAPITALIST STATES. COUNTERING THE FORCES OF AGGRESSION. THE POLICY OF PEACE AND COOPERATION

Comrades, in the period under review the USSR continued to pursue Lenin's policy of peaceful coexistence and mutually beneficial cooperation with capitalist states, while firmly repulsing the aggressive designs of imperialism.

A further aggravation of the general crisis of capitalism was witnessed during these years. To be sure, capitalism has not stopped developing. But it is immersed in what is already the third economic recession in the past ten years.

Inflation has grown to unheard-of dimensions. Since prices in the developed capitalist countries have risen on average by 130 per cent, inflation curve is getting steeper. Not for nothing did the new President of the United States admit in his inaugural address that the United States is suffering from "one of the worst sustained inflations in ... national history", and that "it threatens to shatter the lives of millions" of Americans.

It is more than obvious that state regulation of the capitalist economy is ineffective. The measures that bourgeois governments take against inflation foster stagnation of production and growth of unemployment, what they do to contain the critical drop in production lends still greater momentum to inflation.

The social contradictions have grown visibly more acute. In capitalist society use of the latest scientific and technical achievements in production turns against the working people, and throws millions of factory workers into the streets. In the past ten years the army of unemployed in the developed capitalist states has doubled. In 1980 it totalled 19 million.

Attempts to dampen the intensity of the class struggle by social reforms of some kind are having no success either. The number of strikers has risen by more than one-third in these ten years, and is even officially admitted to have reached the quarter-billion mark.

The inter-imperialist contradictions are growing more acute, the scramble for markets and for sources of raw materials and energy is more frantic. Japanese and West European monopolies compete ever more successfully with US capital, and in the US domestic market too. In the seventies, the share of the United States in world exports has declined by nearly 20 per cent.

The difficulties experienced by capitalism also affect its policy, including foreign policy. The struggle over basic issues of the capitalist countries' foreign-policy course has grown more bitter. Visibly more active of late are the opponents of detente, of limiting armaments, and of improving relations with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

Adventurism and a readiness to gamble with the vital interests of humanity for narrow and selfish ends—this is what has emerged in a particularly bare-faced form in the policy of the more aggressive imperialist circles. With utter contempt for the rights and aspirations of nations, they are trying to portray the liberation struggle of the masses as "terrorism". Indeed, they have set out to achieve the unachievable—to set up a barrier to progressive changes in the world, and to again become the rulers of the peoples' destiny.

Military expenditures are rising unprecedentedly. In the United States they have climbed to an annual 150,000 million dollars. But even these astronomical figures are not high enough for the US military-industrial complex. It is clamouring for more. The NATO allies of the United States, too, yielding to Washington's demands, have undertaken—though some with great reluctance—to increase military allocations automatically until almost the end of the present century.

A considerable portion of these tremendous sums is being spent on crash development of new types of strategic nuclear arms. Their appearance is accompanied by the advancing of military doctrines dangerous to peace, like the notorious Carter directive. They want people to believe that nuclear war

can be limited, they want to reconcile them with the idea that such war is permissible.

But that is sheer deception of the peoples! A "limited" nuclear war as conceived by the Americans in, say, Europe would from the outset mean the certain destruction of European civilisation. And of course the United States, too, would not be able to escape the flames of war. Clearly, such plans and "doctrines" are a grave threat to all nations, including the people of the USA. They are being condemned all over the world. The peoples say an emphatic "No" to them.

Imperialist circles think in terms of domination and compulsion in relation to other states and peoples.

The monopolies need the oil, uranium and non-ferrous metals of other countries, and so the Middle East, Africa and the Indian Ocean are proclaimed spheres of US "vital interests". The US military machine is actively thrusting into these regions, and intends to entrench itself there for a long time to come. Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean, Oman, Kenya, Somalia, Egypt—where next?

To split the expenses with others and at the same time to tie its NATO partners closer to itself, the United States is seeking to extend the functions of NATO. Washington strategists are obviously eager to involve dozens of other countries in their military preparations, and to enmesh the world in a web of US bases, airfields, and arms depots.

To justify this, Washington is spreading the story of a "Soviet threat" to the oil wealth of the Middle East or the oil supply lines. That is a deliberate falsehood, because its authors know perfectly well that the Soviet Union has no intention of impinging on either the one or the other. And in general, it is absurd to think that the oil interests of the West can be "defended" by turning that region into a powder keg.

No, we have completely different views on how peace can really be secured in and around the Persian Gulf. Instead of deploying more and more naval and air armadas, troops and arms there, we propose that the military threat should be removed by concluding an international agreement. A state of stability and calm can be created in that region by joint effort, with due account for the legitimate interests of all sides. The sovereign rights of the countries there, and the security of maritime and other communications connecting the region

with the rest of the world, can be guaranteed. That is the meaning of the proposals made recently by the Soviet Union.

This initiative gained broad support in the world, including a number of Persian Gulf countries. To be sure, there were also opponents of the Soviet proposal, and it is easy to guess in what camp. We would like to express our hope that the governments of the United States and other NATO countries will consider the whole issue calmly and without prejudice, so that we could jointly look for a solution acceptable to all.

Reaching an agreement on this issue could, moreover, give a start to the very important process of reducing the military presence in various regions of the World Ocean.

In our relations with the United States during all these years we have, as before, followed a principled and constructive line. It is only to be regretted that the former administration in Washington* put its stakes on something other than developing relations or on mutual understanding. Trying to exert pressure on us, it set to destroying the positive achievements that had been made with no small effort in Soviet-American relations over the preceding years. As a result, our bilateral ties suffered a setback in a number of fields. The entry into force of the SALT-2 treaty was deferred. And negotiations with us on a number of arms limitation issues, such as reducing arms deliveries to third countries, were broken off unilaterally by the United States.

Unfortunately, also since the change of leadership in the White House** openly bellicose calls and statements have resounded from Washington, as if specially designed to poison the atmosphere of relations between our countries. We would like to hope, however, that those who shape United States policy today will ultimately manage to see things in a more realistic light. The military and strategic equilibrium prevailing between the USSR and the USA, between the Warsaw Treaty and NATO, objectively serves to safeguard world peace. We have not sought, and do not now seek, military superiority over the other side. That is not our policy. But neither will we permit the building up of any such superiority over us.

Attempts of that kind and talking to us from a position of strength are absolutely futile....

Life requires fruitful cooperation of all countries for solving the peaceful, constructive tasks facing every nation and all humanity.

And this cooperation is no futile utopia. Its first signs—be they ever so small so far—are already in evidence in our time. They should be noted, cherished and developed.

Useful cooperation is now under way, also within the framework of international organisations, between a considerable number of states in such fields as peaceful uses of atomic energy, the battle against epidemic diseases, elimination of illiteracy, protection of historical and cultural monuments and weather forecasting. Our country is taking an active part in all this.

In short, there already exists a valid basis for the further extension of practical peaceful cooperation among states. And the need for it is increasingly apparent. It is enough to mention such problems, for example, as discovery and use of new sources of energy, provision of food for the world's growing population, preservation of all the riches of Nature on Earth and exploration of outer space and the depths of the World Ocean....

To safeguard peace—no task is more important now on the international plane for our Party, for our people and, for that matter, for all the peoples of the world.

By safeguarding peace we are working not only for people who are living today, and not only for our children and grandchildren; we are working for the happiness of dozens of future generations.

If there is peace, the creative energy of the peoples backed by the achievements of science and technology is certain to solve the problems that are now troubling people. To be sure, new, still loftier tasks will then arise before our descendants. But that is the dialectics of progress, the dialectics of life.

Not war preparations that doom the peoples to a senseless squandering of their material and spiritual wealth, but consolidation of peace—that is the clue to the future.

**Extract from: THE REPORT
AT A JUBILEE MEETING
OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE
OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION,
THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE USSR,
AND THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE RSFSR
IN THE KREMLIN PALACE OF CONGRESSES,
DECEMBER 21, IN CELEBRATION
OF THE SIXTIETH ANNIVERSARY
OF THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS**

The Report emphasised that in 1922 the peoples of Soviet Russia set free by the victorious 1917 Great October Socialist Revolution voluntarily united in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. National oppression was abolished for ever. Over the years of Soviet government, the country overcame economic and cultural backwardness of the previously oppressed nations and nationalities and eliminated their inequality.

Cited below are extracts from two sections of the Report. Section One (*What Has Been Achieved and Aims of the Nationalities Policy*) speaks of the Soviet people's achievements in solving the nationalities question, and also of the CPSU policy tasks in developing and improving relations among the numerous nations and nationalities inhabiting the USSR.

Section Two (*The USSR—Buttress of the Great Cause of Peace and Freedom of the Peoples*) deals with the USSR's relations with all the other countries and with the incessant struggle of the Soviet people for peace and slackening of international tensions.

1. WHAT HAS BEEN ACHIEVED AND AIMS OF THE NATIONALITIES POLICY

The path traversed by the Soviet Union in 60 years is an epoch in itself. I would say that history has never seen such rapid progress from backwardness, misery, and ruin to a mighty, modern great power with an extremely high level of culture and a constantly rising living standard.

What are the most significant results of our development?

— History has fully borne out the theory of Marx and Lenin that the nationalities question can only be settled on a class basis. National discord and all forms of racial and national inequality and oppression receded into the past together with social antagonisms.

— It has been compellingly demonstrated that the Communist Party and its scientific policy are the guiding force in the socialist settlement of the nationalities question and the guarantor that this settlement is correct.

— Backward outlying regions populated by ethnic minorities, in many of which feudal-patriarchal and even clan relations were still dominant, have disappeared.

— An integral union-wide economic complex has formed on the basis of the dynamic economic growth of all the republics, a growth guided by the general state plan.

— There has been a qualitative change of the social structure of the republics: a modern working class has emerged in each of them, the peasants have been moving along the new road of collective farming, an intelligentsia of its own has been created, and skilled cadres have been trained in all areas of the life of state and society.

— A socialist multinational culture has burgeoned on the basis of progressive traditions and an intensive exchange of cultural values.

— Socialist nations have formed, and these now comprise a new historical community—the Soviet people.

The interests of the republics are intertwining ever more closely, and the mutual assistance and the mutual links that

direct the creative efforts of the nations and nationalities of the USSR into a single channel are growing more productive. The all-sided development of each of the socialist nations in our country logically brings them ever closer together.

Each of the Union Republics—the Russian Federation, the Ukraine and Byelorussia, Uzbekistan and Kazakhstan, Georgia and Azerbaijan, Lithuania and Moldavia, Latvia and Kirghizia, Tajikistan and Armenia, Turkmenia and Estonia—each, I repeat, of the Union Republics is making an invaluable contribution to the overall growth of the economy and culture of the Soviet Union. This, comrades, is not simply an adding together, but a multiplication of our creative capability.

All the nations and nationalities living in the twenty Autonomous Republics and eighteen Autonomous Regions and Areas are successfully unfolding their potentialities in a fraternal family. The millions of Germans, Poles, Koreans, Kurds, and people of other nationalities, for whom the Soviet Union has long ago become the homeland, are fullfledged Soviet citizens.

The peoples of our country address special words of gratitude to the Russian people. In none of the republics would the present achievements have been conceivable without their disinterested fraternal assistance. The Russian language, which has become a natural part of the life of millions of people of every nationality, is a factor of exceptional importance in the country's economic, political, and cultural life, in the drawing together of all its nations and nationalities, in making the riches of world civilisation accessible to them.

The new Constitution of the USSR is a major landmark in the consolidation of Soviet society's national-state foundations. This outstanding document not only sums up the results of preceding development but enshrines solid and lasting political and legal principles for the further burgeoning and drawing together of all of the country's nations and nationalities.

The tangible qualitative changes that have taken place in the course of 60 years in the relations between nationalities are evidence that the nationalities question, as it was left to us by the exploiting system, has been settled successfully, finally and irreversibly. For the first time in history the multinational

character of a country has turned from a source of weakness into a source of strength and prosperity....

Today, on this anniversary, we pay tribute to the many generations of Soviet people of all nationalities, men and women, workers, peasants, and intellectuals, Party and government functionaries, men of the Armed Forces, Communists and non-Party people, to all who built socialism, upheld it in a bitter war, and made a reality of the millennia-long dream of equality, friendship, and brotherhood among peoples.

Comrades, in summing up what has been accomplished, we, naturally, give most of our attention to what still remains to be done. Our end goal is clear. It is, to quote Lenin, "not only to bring the nations closer together but to integrate them".* The Party is well aware that the road to this goal is a long one. On no account must there be either any forestalling of events or any holding back of processes that have already matured.

The successes in settling the nationalities question by no means signify that all the problems generated by the very fact of the life and work of numerous nations and nationalities in a single state have vanished. This is hardly possible as long as nations exist, as long as there are national distinctions. And these will exist for a long time to come, much longer than class distinctions.

That is why the perfection of developed socialism—and this is precisely how we can define the basic content of the work of the Party and the people at the present stage—must include a carefully considered, scientific policy in the nationalities question. I should like to speak of some of its aims.

I have already mentioned what enormous benefits and advantages a single union has given the peoples and republics of our country. However, the potentialities being opened by such a union are far from having been exhausted.

Take the economy. Modern productive forces demand integration even in the case of different countries. Much more so do they require the close and skilful coordination of the efforts of the various regions and republics of one and the

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 146.

same country. The most judicious utilisation of the natural and labour resources and climatic specifics of each republic and the most rational inclusion of this potential into that of the union as a whole is what will yield the greatest benefit to each region, to each nation and nationality, and to the state as a whole.

Such is our fundamental guideline. To put it into effect much will have to be done by our central and local planning and economic agencies. There will have to be a further improvement in the distribution of the productive forces, of regional specialisation and cooperation, and of the patterns of economic links and transportation. This is not an easy task, of course, but it is on the agenda and its fulfilment holds out the promise of considerable benefit.

The whole country is now working on the Food Programme. It clearly defines concrete aims for all the Union Republics. And each of them will have to work hard in order to make a tangible contribution—in the immediate future—to the key matter of ensuring an uninterrupted supply of food for Soviet people.

We know that the adopted programme deals with immediate, urgent tasks. But if we take a long-term view, it becomes obvious that further development of our agro-industrial complex—and, for that matter, the country's economy as a whole—will require a more indepth and consistent specialisation of agriculture on a nationwide scale.

One more point. In a vast country like ours transport plays a particularly distinctive role—economic, political and, if you will, psychological.

It is very difficult to ensure the accelerated development of all our republics and further intensification of their economic cooperation without smoothly functioning transport. But transport is important not only for purely economic reasons. The development of transport, of the road network, will, for example, greatly help to stabilise personnel in rural communities by bringing rural areas closer to urban ones. It will, of course, also help to cope with the major social task of securing more rational and flexible use of manpower. By facilitating everyday personal contacts on a country-wide scale, by facilitating vital ties between all the republics and areas of our country, transport brings the achievements of our

socialist civilisation, in the broadest sense of the term, within reach of people.

Our joining in a union has become an added source of material, and indeed, spiritual wealth of the Soviet people. Here too, however, we are still not using all the available potentialities by far. We should look persistently for new methods and forms of work suiting present-day needs and making for still more fruitful mutual enrichment of cultures, and give everyone still broader access to all that is best in the culture of each of our peoples. Radio and television—and naturally, other mass media—must play a steadily increasing role in this noble endeavour.

Of course, here we must remember that there are both good and bad, outdated elements in the cultural heritage, traditions and customs of each nation. Hence another task—not to conserve these bad elements but to get rid of all that is antiquated and that runs counter to the norms of Soviet community life, to socialist morality, and our communist ideals.

The record shows that the economic and cultural progress of all nations and nationalities is inevitably accompanied by the growth of their national self-awareness. This is a logical, objective process. It is important, however, that the natural pride one takes in the gains attained should not degenerate into national arrogance or conceit, that it should not gravitate towards exclusiveness, and disrespect for other nations and nationalities. Yet, such negative phenomena still occur. And it would be wrong to attribute them solely to survivals of the past. Among other things, they are sometimes fostered by the mistakes we make in our work. Here, comrades, nothing can be dismissed as insignificant. Everything counts—the attitude to the language, to monuments of the past, the interpretation of historical events, and the way we transform rural and urban areas and influence living and working conditions.

Natural migration of the population is making each of our republics—and, to varying degrees, each region and each city—increasingly multinational. This means that Party and government bodies, and all our local cadres, are becoming increasingly instrumental in implementing the Party's nationalities policy. And they have to carry forward the lofty principles of that policy day after day, ensuring harmonious,

fraternal relations between representatives of all, both big and small, nations and nationalities in work and daily life.

The Party has always attached great attention to the growth of the national detachments of the Soviet working class, the leading force of our society. The results are there for all to see. These days, workers make up the largest social group in all the Union Republics. In some of them, however, the indigenous nationality should be represented in the working class more fully. Hence the task set by the 26th Congress of the CPSU—to expand and improve the training of skilled workers from among all the nations and nationalities residing in the republics. The need for this is both economic and political. Multinational work collectives, above all those in industry, are that very milieu in which the internationalist spirit is fostered best, and the fraternal relations and friendship among the peoples of the USSR grow stronger.

Representation in Party and state bodies of the republics and the Union as a whole is also a highly important question. The reference here, of course, is not to any formal quotas. Arithmetic is no way to deal with the problem of representation. There should be a consistent effort to ensure proper representation of all nationalities in any republic in the various Party and government bodies at all levels. Due regard to competence, to moral and political qualities, care and attention, and great tact in selecting and posting cadres are especially necessary in view of the multinational composition of the Union and Autonomous Republics.

A constant and ever-important task is to continue instilling in Soviet people a spirit of mutual respect and friendship for all the nations and nationalities of the country, of love for their great Soviet country, of internationalism and solidarity with the working people of other countries. It is up to all Party and YCL organisations, the Soviets, trade unions and our Armed Forces, which have always been a good school of internationalism, to work towards this end. It should also be an everyday concern of all educational establishments in our country.

In the sphere of internationalist education, as in all our ideological and mass political work, we are facing big tasks. Concrete and convincing demonstration of our achievements, earnest analysis of new problems constantly generated by life,

and freshness of thought and language—these are the elements we need to improve our propaganda, which must always be truthful and realistic, as well as interesting and easy to understand, and therefore more effective.

Further advancement of friendship and cooperation among the peoples of the USSR depends to a great extent on the deepening of socialist democracy. Increasingly broad involvement of people of all nationalities in the management of social and state affairs is, to put it in concise terms, the leading trend in our country's political life. And the Party will do everything to promote and advance it.

Comrades, all this means that problems of relations among nations are still on the agenda in the society of mature socialism. They call for particular care and constant attention on the part of the Communist Party. The Party should delve into them deeply and chart the ways of solving them, enriching the Leninist principles of the nationalities policy with the experience of developed socialism.

We speak boldly both about the existing problems and the outstanding tasks because we know for sure that we are equal to them, that we can and must solve them. A disposition to action rather than rhetoric is what we need today to make the great and powerful Union of Soviet Socialist Republics even stronger. I am sure that this view is shared by all those gathered in this hall, by all our Party, by all Soviet people.

2. THE USSR—BUTTIRESS OF THE GREAT CAUSE OF PEACE AND FREEDOM OF THE PEOPLES

Comrades, on December 30, 1922, the very day the Declaration and Treaty on the Formation of the USSR were adopted in Moscow, it was stated at the Lausanne Conference on Lenin's instructions that, guided by the interests of universal peace, the Soviet Republics consider it "their urgent duty ... to do everything in their power to facilitate the establishment of political equality among races, respect for the right of peoples to self-determination and to complete political and economic independence of all states".*

This was how the essence of the fundamentally new foreign policy, which the world's first country of socialism had begun to carry forward consistently, was set forth in plain and comprehensible terms.

And as new socialist countries emerged, a completely new type of international relations began to take shape. These relations are based on ideological unity, common goals and comradely cooperation with full respect for the interests, distinctive features and traditions of each country. At their centre is the principle of socialist internationalism.

The socialist countries had to blaze new trails in the development of these relations. Mankind's past experience could not suggest answers to the problems that life set before them. Naturally, not everything worked out right away. All the more so because the countries which made up the world socialist system started in many ways from different levels—both in terms of domestic development and specific external conditions. Nor did they always succeed in drawing timely conclusions from the changes within the socialist world itself. The international situation, too, did not allow time for reflection: the new forms of relations had to be tested on the go, as people say. There were illusions we had had to abandon, and mistakes for which we had had to pay a price.

But as we assess the present day of our countries, we can say with satisfaction that we have learned a lot, and that the socialist community is a powerful and healthy organism which is playing an enormous and beneficial role in the world of today. The mechanism of fraternal cooperation encompasses the most diverse spheres of life in our countries and different areas of our joint socialist construction. By pooling our resources we are finding increasingly effective ways of harmonising the interests of the community with those of each member country.

True, even now we cannot say that all the difficulties are behind us, that we have attained our ideal. What was good enough yesterday needs improving today. The countries of our community face many serious tasks—those of defending our socialist gains and values against the imperialist onslaught, of fighting together for durable peace and detente, further improving our political cooperation and, finally, providing new impulse to economic integration.

In short, much has still to be done. And I would like to assure you that for its part the Soviet Union will do its utmost to make the world socialist system stronger and more prosperous.

Comrades, the socialist experience of solving the nationalities question is being closely studied in scores of countries which have freed themselves from the colonial yoke. Our achievements in building socialism, our history-making victory over fascism, and the flowering of all the Soviet nations and nationalities have been a powerful stimulant for the national liberation struggle.

The Soviet Union's vigorous and resolute struggle for the elimination of colonialism, its unfailing support of the cause of the liberation and equality of nations facilitate their advance to freedom and progress. This is well known by the peoples of Asia and Africa, the Arab East and Latin America.

The young states that have flung off the colonial yoke are at present going through a difficult period of national self-assertion and social development. They are hampered by their colonial heritage of backwardness, internal strife and conflict. Not yet strong enough, they are in danger of falling into the numerous neocolonialist traps. However, we are confident that resolute resistance to imperialism, a well-founded strategy of economic and socio-political development, mutual respect for each other's interests and rights will enable their peoples to overcome these difficulties, which we might describe as growing pains. Soviet people wish them great success in consolidating their independence, and in their fight for prosperity and progress.

We respect the nonaligned movement whose policy of peace is making a useful contribution to international relations. We are squarely and unswervingly on the side of those who still have to fight for freedom, independence and the very survival of their peoples, those who are forced to rebuff aggression or are threatened with it. Our position here is inseparable from the Soviet Union's consistent and tireless struggle for durable peace on earth.

Over these six decades the position of our Soviet state has changed radically; its prestige and influence have grown enormously. Close peaceful cooperation links the Soviet Union with countries on all continents. Its voice commands

respect at international forums. The principles of peaceful coexistence—the basis of Soviet foreign policy—have won broad international recognition and have been incorporated into scores of international instruments, including the Final Act of the European Conference in Helsinki. Soviet proposals have been the basis of major UN decisions on strengthening peace and security.

But each step along the road to more durable peace has taken and does take a lot of effort; it calls for intense struggle against imperialist warhawks. This struggle has become especially acute now that the more warlike factions in the West have become very active, their class-based hatred of socialism prevailing over considerations of realism and sometimes over plain common sense.

The imperialists have not given up schemes of economic war against the socialist countries, of interfering in their internal affairs in the hope of eroding their social system, and are trying to win military superiority over the USSR, over all the countries of the socialist community.

Of course, these plans are sure to fail. It is not given to anyone to turn back the course of historical development. Attempts to "strangle" socialism failed even when the Soviet state was still getting on its feet and was the only socialist country in the world. So, surely, nothing will come of it now.

But one cannot help seeing that Washington's present policy has sharpened the international situation to dangerous extremes.

The war preparations of the United States and the NATO bloc which it leads have grown to an unheard-of, record scale. Official spokesmen in Washington are heard to discourse on the possibility of "limited", "sustained" and other varieties of nuclear war. This is intended to reassure people, to accustom them to the thought that such war is acceptable. Veritably, one has to be blind to the realities of our time not to see that wherever and however a nuclear whirlwind arises, it will inevitably go out of control and cause a world-wide catastrophe.

Our position on this issue is clear: a nuclear war—whether big or small, whether limited or total—must not be allowed to break out. No task is more important today than to stop the instigators of another war. This is required by the vital

interests of all nations. That is why the unilateral commitment of the Soviet Union not to use nuclear weapons first was received with approval and hope all over the world. If our example is followed by the other nuclear powers, this will be a truly momentous contribution to the efforts of preventing nuclear war.

It is said that the West cannot take such a commitment because, allegedly, the Warsaw Treaty has an advantage in conventional armaments. To begin with, this is untrue, and the facts and figures bear witness to it. Furthermore, as everybody knows, we are in favour of limiting such armaments as well, and of searching for sensible, mutually acceptable solutions to this end. We are also prepared to agree that the sides should renounce first use of conventional, as well as nuclear arms.

Of course, one of the main avenues leading to a real scaling down of the threat of nuclear war is that of reaching a Soviet-American agreement on limitation and reduction of strategic nuclear arms. We approach negotiations on the matter with the utmost responsibility, and seek an honest agreement that will do no damage to either side and will, at the same time, lead to a reduction of their nuclear arsenals.

So far, unfortunately, we see a different approach by the American side. While calling for "radical reductions" in word, what it really has in mind is essentially a reduction of the Soviet strategic potential. For itself, the United States would like to leave a free hand in building up strategic armaments. It is absurd even to think that we can agree to this. It would, of course, suit the Pentagon, but can on no account be acceptable to the Soviet Union and, for that matter, to all those who have a stake in preserving and consolidating peace.

Compare to this the proposals of the USSR. They are based on the principle of preserving parity. We are prepared to reduce our strategic arms by more than 25 per cent. US arms, too, must be reduced accordingly, so that the two states have the same number of strategic delivery vehicles. We also propose that the number of nuclear warheads should be substantially lowered and that improvement of nuclear weapons should be maximally restricted.

Our proposals refer to all types of strategic weapons without exception, and envisage reduction of their stockpiles

by many hundreds of units. They close all possible channels for any further arms race in this field. And that is only a start: the pertinent agreement would be the point of departure for a still larger mutual reduction of such weapons, which the sides could agree upon, with due account of the general strategic situation in the world.

And while the negotiations are under way, we offer what is suggested by common sense: to freeze the strategic arsenals of the two sides. The US government does not want this, and now everyone can understand why: it has embarked on a new, considerable build-up of nuclear armaments.

Washington's attempts to justify this build-up are obviously irrelevant. The allegation of a "lag" behind the USSR which the Americans must close, is a deliberate untruth. This has been said more than once. And the talk that new weapons systems, such as the MX missile, are meant "to facilitate disarmament negotiations" is altogether absurd.

No programmes of a further arms build-up will ever force the Soviet Union to make unilateral concessions. We will be compelled to counter the challenge of the American side by deploying corresponding weapons systems of our own—an analogous missile to counter the MX missile, and our own long-range cruise missile, which we are now testing, to counter the US long-range cruise missile.

Those are not threats at all. We are wholly averse to any such course of events, and are doing everything to avoid it. But it is essential that those who shape US policy, as well as the public at large, should be perfectly clear on the real state of affairs. Hence, if the people in Washington really believe that new weapons systems will be a "trump" for the Americans at negotiations, we want them to know that these "trumps" are false. Any policy directed to securing military superiority over the Soviet Union has no future and can only heighten the threat of war.

Now a few words about what are known as confidence-building measures. We are serious about them.

Given the swift action and power of modern weapons, the atmosphere of mutual suspicion is especially dangerous. Even a mere accident, miscalculation, or technical failure can have tragic consequences. It is therefore important to take the finger off the trigger, and put a reliable safety catch on all

weapons. A few things have already been accomplished to this effect, particularly in the framework of the Helsinki accords. As everybody knows, the Soviet Union is also offering measures of a more far-reaching nature and of broader scope. Our proposals on this score have been tabled at the Soviet-American negotiations in Geneva on limitation and reduction of nuclear armaments.

We are also prepared to consider pertinent proposals made by others... But the measures [they] referred to are not enough to dispel the atmosphere of mutual suspicion, and to restore confidence. Something more is needed: to normalise the situation, and to renounce incitement of hostility and hatred, and propaganda of nuclear war. And, surely, the road to confidence, to preventing any and all wars, including an accidental one, is that of stopping the arms race and going back to calm, respectful relations between states, back to detente....

In conclusion, let me say the following. We are for broad, fruitful cooperation among all nations of the world to their mutual advantage and the good of all mankind, free from diktat and interference in the affairs of other countries. The Soviet Union will do everything it can to secure a tranquil, peaceful future for the present and coming generations. That is the aim of our policy, and we shall not depart from it.

Yuri Andropov

**KARL MARX'S TEACHING
AND SOME OF THE PROBLEMS
IN THE BUILDING OF SOCIALISM IN THE USSR**

Yuri Andropov wrote this article to mark the 165th anniversary of Marx's birth and the centenary of his demise. He emphasises that in recent decades the course of world history has brilliantly corroborated Marx's doctrine. The socialism that has been built in many countries is Marxist scientific socialism incarnate.

The article shows that the construction of a new socialist society is not devoid of difficulties and contradictions, and that the latter are being overcome in the USSR while perfecting present-day developed socialism. As a result, the foundations of the new socio-economic relations between people so brilliantly foreseen by Marx grow stronger.

One hundred years have passed since the death of Karl Marx. A whole century. A century of dramatic upheavals, revolutionary storms and fundamental changes in mankind's destiny; a century which has refuted and swept away a multitude of philosophical concepts, social theories and political doctrines. It has been a century of successive victories by Marxism, of its growing impact on social development.

With the march of time, the meaning and scale of Karl Marx's lifelong feat become increasingly clear.

For millennia people have been looking for a way to restructure society on a just basis, to rid themselves of exploitation, coercion, and material and intellectual poverty. Great minds have devoted themselves to that quest. Generation after generation, fighters for the people's happiness sacrificed their lives for that goal. But it was in Marx's titanic activities that the investigations of a great scholar merged for the first time with the dedicated practical work of a leader and organiser of the revolutionary movement of the masses.

Marx is rightly considered the successor to all the best that was created by classical German philosophy, English political economy and French utopian socialism. But, after critically reassessing their achievements, he went much further. First and foremost, because he undertook a task which he formulated with depth and simplicity, as befits a genius: "The philosophers have only *interpreted* the world in various ways; the point, however, is to *change it*."^{*} Marx devoted all the power of his remarkable mind and his entire life to the cause of the revolutionary transformation of the world.

A distinctive feature of Marxism is the unity of consistently scientific theory and revolutionary practice. Marx's scientific work could only have unfolded in inseparable connection with

the independent entry into the political arena of the proletariat, then a very young class historically. Marx had the good fortune to see how the prophetic words he had pronounced in his youth were translated into reality: "As philosophy finds its material weapons in the proletariat, so the proletariat finds its spiritual weapons in philosophy."*

The philosophy which Marx gave the working class was a revolution in the history of social thought. Humanity did not even know a fraction as much about itself as it has learnt thanks to Marxism. Marx's teaching, presented in the organic integrity of dialectical and historical materialism, political economy and the theory of scientific communism, was a real revolution in world outlook and simultaneously illuminated the road to the most profound social revolutions.

Marx revealed the objective, basically material, laws of the march of history. He discovered them where previously everything had seemed to be either a trick of chance, the despotism of individuals, or had been presented as the self-expression of a mythical world spirit. He perceived the essence behind the visible, the apparent, behind the phenomenon. He ripped the shroud of secrecy from capitalist production, from the exploitation of labour by capital; he showed how surplus value is created and by whom it is appropriated.

Frederick Engels, Marx's great friend and companion-in-arms, attached special importance to Marx's two major discoveries—the materialist interpretation of history and the theory of surplus value. And it is easy to see why. These discoveries made it possible to turn socialism from a utopia into a science, to provide a scientific interpretation of the class struggle. They made possible what Lenin described as the chief component of Marx's doctrine: the elucidation of "the historic role of the proletariat as the builder of socialist society".**

Yes, Karl Marx was a great scholar. But he was also a great practical revolutionary. It is astonishing how much he

was able to do for the attainment of the goals that he had indicated.

Marx, together with Engels, founded the Communist League—the first political organisation of the class-conscious, revolutionary proletariat. He was thus the first Communist in the most contemporary meaning of the word, the pioneer of today's worldwide movement.

"Nothing but an international bond of the working classes can ever ensure their definitive triumph,"* wrote Marx. And he himself, the founder of the First International, worked tirelessly to forge international workers' unity. The political behests of Marx and Engels to the Communists of the world are inconceivable without the fiery call, "Workers of All Countries, Unite!"

Marx, convinced internationalist that he was, was unsurpassed at grasping the specifics of the situation in the most varied countries—from England to India, from France to China, and from the USA to Ireland. At the same time, when closely examining the life of a people, he constantly sought its interconnection with the life of the whole world. And here he always posed the fundamental question: who will begin the revolutionary destruction of the capitalist order and who will be the first to set out on the road to humanity's communist future?

History provided the answer to this question. It fell to the lot of the proletariat of Russia to be the revolutionary trailblazers. Even today there are "critics" of the October Revolution who assert that it took place contrary to all of Marx's expectations. They pretend that Marx did not take Russia into account at all in his revolutionary forecasts. But in actual fact he showed a great interest in Russian affairs and learned Russian in order to understand them better. An irreconcilable opponent of tsarism, he prophetically assessed the prospects of the mounting social movement in Russia, and saw that in it was ripening a "most grandiose social revolution",** which would be of worldwide significance. Indeed, Marx was even a better judge of future events than some present-day "critics" are of events of the past.

Engels said that Marx's death left a yawning gap in the ranks of the embattled proletariat. It was indeed an immense loss. But Marx's banner remained in reliable hands. It was carried aloft by Engels himself, who stood at the head of the rising revolutionary working-class movement. It was in Engels's lifetime that Vladimir Ilyich Lenin entered the arena of the proletarian class struggle.

Lenin was a loyal follower of Marx and Engels. As he himself said, he could not tolerate even the slightest aspersion cast on his great teachers. That was only to be expected of the man who did more than anyone else not only for the defence of Marxism, but also, under new historical conditions, for the creative development of all its component parts and for its practical implementation. He elevated Marxism to a new and higher stage. Lenin's name is inseparable from the name of Marx. Leninism is Marxism of the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, of the collapse of the colonial system, the epoch of mankind's transition from capitalism to socialism. In our time Marxism is simply impossible outside of and without Leninism.

Lenin and the Bolshevik Party he founded led the first victorious socialist revolution, which has radically changed the socio-political make-up of the world. Thus a new era was ushered in—the era of the grand accomplishments and historic gains of the working class and the mass of the people. Thus scientific socialism, created by Marx, has merged with the actual practice of the millions of working people building a new society.

Today the rich content of Marx's teaching is being revealed to us much more widely and deeply than to his contemporaries, for it is one thing to perceive the idea of the historical need for socialism in its theoretical form and quite another to be both a participant in and witness of that idea's implementation.

The rise of socialism did not take place, in all respects, in the concrete historical ways which the founders of our revolutionary theory had expected. First socialism triumphed in a single country which, moreover, was not the most developed one economically. The crux of the matter lies in that the

October Revolution took place in the epoch of imperialism, under new historical conditions which had not existed in Marx's lifetime. This was mirrored in Lenin's theory of socialist revolution, which has been fully corroborated by life.

Bourgeois and reformist ideologists are to this day building whole systems of arguments in an attempt to prove that the new society built in the USSR and the other fraternal countries differs from the image of socialism which Marx visualised. They say that the reality and the ideal are at variance. But, wittingly or through ignorance, they overlook the fact that, in elaborating his teaching, Marx himself was guided least of all by the requirements of some abstract ideal of a neat, sleek "socialism". He deduced his ideas of the future system from an analysis of the objective contradictions of large-scale capitalist production. It is this science-based approach which enabled him to determine correctly the main features of the society which was yet to be born in the purifying thunderstorms of the social revolutions in the 20th century.

According to Marx, social property in the means of production is the cornerstone of the socio-economic system that replaces capitalism. The clear-cut words of the *Manifesto of the Communist Party* emphasised the significance which Marxism attaches to this necessary revolution in production relations: "...the theory of the Communists may be summed up in the single sentence: Abolition of private property."*

The historical experience of real, existing socialism shows that it is no simple matter to turn "mine"—privately-owned—into "ours"—collectively-owned. The revolution in property relations can by no means be reduced to a single act, as a result of which the basic means of production become the property of the whole people. Acquiring ownership rights and becoming a real, wise and efficient owner-manager are not at all the same thing. Having accomplished a socialist revolution, the people have a long way to go before they learn their new position as the supreme and undivided owners of the entire public wealth—preparing themselves for it economically.

politically and, if you like, psychologically, developing a collectivist mentality and behaviour. For a person of socialist upbringing is only someone who is concerned not just with working well himself, with his own well-being and prestige, but also with the performance of his work-mates and the work collective, and with the interests of the whole country and the working people throughout the world.

The turning of "mine" into "ours", it should be remembered, is a long and multifaceted process which should not be oversimplified. Even when socialist production relations have been established once and for all, some people still preserve, and even reproduce, individualistic habits, a striving to enrich themselves at the expense of others, at the expense of society. In Marx's terminology, all this is a consequence of the alienation of labour, and does not automatically and suddenly evaporate from people's minds, although the alienation itself has already been eliminated.

We are now well aware of all this from the practice of building socialism and communism. But there is something else we know as well: in full conformity with what Marx foresaw, wherever proletarian revolutions have been victorious, social property in the means of production has been firmly established in one form or another and has also become the main factor of the existence of socialism, its foundation and the main source of its progress.

A powerful economy developing according to a plan has been created in our country on the basis of socialist property. This economy makes it possible to set and fulfil national economic and social tasks that are large in scale and complex in content. It goes without saying that the realisation of these potentialities of ours does not take place by itself. Problems and serious difficulties arise. They may have different origins, but these origins are never connected with the essence of the social, collective property, which has been established and has proved its advantages. On the contrary, many of the shortcomings which sometimes upset normal work in this or that area of our national economy are caused by deviations from the norms and requirements of economic life, whose keystone is socialist property in the means of production.

Take, for example, the question of economical and rational use of material, financial and labour resources. The fulfilment

of the current five-year plan and the future development of our economy largely depend on the resolution of this question. When you get down to it, this is a matter of observing the necessary norm of economic management prescribed by socialist property. Its essence lies in a thrifty attitude to the property of the whole people, and in showing initiative and vigour in multiplying it. All of society has to pay for a violation of that norm, and it has the right strictly to call to account those who squander its wealth through negligence, incompetence or selfishness.

Our concerns now centre on increasing the efficiency of production and of the economy as a whole. The Party and Soviet people are deeply aware of the importance of that problem. But its practical solution is not going ahead as successfully as necessary. What is the hitch? Why are we not getting the returns we should from the huge capital investments? Why are the achievements of science and technology not being introduced into production at satisfactory rates?

Many reasons can be mentioned, of course. In the first place, we cannot fail to see that our work to improve and reorganise the economic mechanism and the forms and methods of management falls short of the requirements at the present level of the material, technical, social and spiritual development of Soviet society. That is the main thing. At the same time there are, of course, the effects of such factors as the considerable shortfall in agricultural production in the last four years, and the need to channel more and more funds and material resources to tap the fuel, energy and raw material resources in our country's northern and eastern regions.

One can repeat over and over again Marx's basic idea that appropriate forms of organisation of economic life are needed to speed up progress of the productive forces, but things will not be set in motion until this theoretical truth is translated into the concrete language of practice. It is of paramount importance today to consider and consistently implement measures capable of giving full scope to the operation of the enormous creative forces inherent in our economy. These measures should be carefully prepared and realistic, and this means that in planning them it is necessary always to proceed from the laws governing the development of the economic system of socialism. The objective character of these laws

makes it necessary to avoid any attempts to run the economy by methods alien to its nature. It is useful to recall here Lenin's warning about the danger of the naive belief of some officials that they can solve all problems "by issuing communist decrees".*

On the other hand, it is impermissible to leave a project unfinished once we have agreed on the necessary measures and taken decisions. Everything that is decided should be carried out. This is the Leninist tradition of our Party and it is not fitting for us to depart from it.

The interests of society as a whole are the most important guide for the development of an economy based on socialist property. But it certainly does not follow from this that socialism suppresses or ignores personal or local interests, or the specific requirements of different social groups. Not at all. As Marx and Engels stressed, "The 'idea' always disgraced itself insofar as it differed from the 'interest'".**

One of the most important tasks in improving our national economic mechanism is to ensure that these interests are duly taken into account and are combined in the best possible way with the interests of the entire people and thus used as a motive force for the growth of the Soviet economy, for improving its efficiency, for raising labour productivity, and for all-round strengthening of the economic and defence might of the Soviet state.

The efficiency of a socialist national economy should, of course, be judged not only by purely economic criteria but also by social ones, bearing in mind the ultimate goal of social production. Under capitalism that goal is profit on capital; under socialism—as Marx proved theoretically—it is the welfare of the working people and creation of the conditions for all-round development of the individual. Existing socialism gives this proposition of Marx flesh and blood.

Indeed, however multifaceted the tasks confronting the Soviet economy, in the final analysis they all merge into one:

to ensure the growth of the working people's well-being and create the material conditions for further flowering of their intellectual, cultural life and their active participation in the affairs of society. That is what determines the general direction of the CPSU's economic policy and it is reflected in the documents of the Party's 26th Congress, in the Food Programme now being carried out, and in the Party decisions on concrete economic matters. It is clear that this also determines many, very many, things in our approach to the rationalisation of production, to its intensification. In other words, in our country the problems of raising economic efficiency are decided in the interests of the working people, and not at their expense. This does not make our work any simpler but it allows us to conduct it relying on the inexhaustible strength, knowledge and creative energies of the entire Soviet people.

Marx saw the historical mission of the system that replaces capitalism to lie in turning work from an unpleasant and compulsory duty into the primary vital need of the individual. We now know from experience how much needs to be done on the long road to complete realisation of this idea. But we have already completed the decisive stage. An end has been put to the situation, inherent in capitalism, where the product of labour is opposed to the worker as an alien and even inimical object and where the greater the physical and mental efforts he exerts, the more powerful his oppressors become. The most significant and indisputable gain of socialism is that it has created the conditions that ensure everyone the right to work. It is work, conscious and conscientious work, work done with initiative, work for the benefit of society, that is recognised in our society as the highest gauge of a person's merit and public prestige.

Practice has also demonstrated that socialisation of the means and objects of production is a necessary and effective factor for the formation of the social climate inherent in socialism, a climate in which man does not have an oppressive feeling of uncertainty about the morrow, a climate in which the collectivist spirit and comradely mutual assistance, moral health and social optimism are prevalent. All this taken together means a fundamentally new quality of life for the working masses, a quality which is not by any means

reducible to material comfort but encompasses the entire spectrum of a flourishing life.

Naturally, all this cannot be achieved overnight, the very next day after social property has been established. It therefore cannot be assessed immediately as a "completed", accomplished socialism. A change in property relations does not by itself remove all the negative features of human relationships that have accumulated over the centuries. The fact is that without such a change any "model" of socialism, however attractively clothed, will prove unviable and will exist only in the imagination of its architects. This is axiom of Marxism, and it holds true today as it did a hundred years ago.

The so-called axioms of Marxism should be approached with care since life itself inflicts severe punishment if they are misunderstood or ignored. For example, it was at the cost of great efforts, and even mistakes, that the full significance of Marx's views concerning distribution came to be appreciated. He persistently pointed out that in the first phase of communism every working man "receives back from society—after the deductions have been made—exactly what he gives to it", in short, strictly according to the amount and quality of his work,* that is, in keeping with the basic principle of socialism: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his work." An irreproachable democrat and humanist, Marx was a strong opponent of levelling and categorically rejected the demagogic or naive talk, not infrequent in his time, too, about socialism as "universal equality" in distribution and consumption.

Today not only the social and economic significance but also the tremendous political weight of these views of the founder of scientific communism have become clear from practice, from the experience of many socialist countries. Indeed, relations of distribution directly and immediately affect the interests of everyone without exception. The nature

of distribution is essentially one of the major indicators of the degree of social equality possible under socialism. Any attempts to exceed this possible degree at will, to lunge ahead—to communist forms of distribution—without accurately assessing the labour contribution made by each person to the creation of the material and spiritual wealth can, and do, give rise to undesirable phenomena.

Thus, it became quite clear that any violation of the objective economic requirement for a priority growth of labour productivity is inadmissible. While producing a favourable impression at first, a wage increase if it is not inseparably linked up with this decisive factor eventually has a negative effect on the whole of economic life. Specifically, it stimulates demands which cannot be fully satisfied at the given level of production and hampers steps to eliminate shortages with all their ugly consequences, justly resented by the working people.

Certainly, correct solution of the problems of distribution under socialism presupposes that the money the population has should be matched by adequate amounts of varied consumer goods and services, the determining factor being the level of development of the productive forces. It is, of course, impossible to satisfy requirements that exceed our possibilities. At the same time it has been and will continue to be our duty to work in two directions: first, to ensure the steady growth of social production and, on this basis, a rise in the Soviet people's living standards and cultural level; and second, to promote in every way a rise in the level of their material and cultural requirements.

Full social equality does not come overnight and in a finished form. It takes society quite a long time, and requires great efforts, to reach that stage of maturity, to work up to it. Society must develop its productive forces to the level of the material and technical basis of communism. It must cultivate in every working man high consciousness and culture, professionalism and the ability to make rational use of the benefits of socialism.

As long as such conditions are absent, the Party guiding the socialist society has to focus attention on the distribution relations, on strict control over the measure of work and the measure of consumption. The CPSU constantly sees to it that

the principle of socialist distribution revealed by Marx is implemented everywhere and without fail, and that it is better and more fully applied. If this principle is violated we have to face unearned incomes, so-called rolling stones, shirkers, slackers, and bad workmen who in effect sponge on society and live off the mass of conscientious workers. This is something which must not be tolerated; it is like living parasitically on the humanism of our system.

It is work and work alone, its actual results and not somebody's subjective desire or goodwill, which should determine the level of material well-being of every citizen. This approach is fully in keeping with the spirit and letter of Marx's views concerning distribution under socialism.

We have a long-established system of material and moral work incentives. It has been serving us quite well in the building of socialism and communism. But today, both this system itself and its forms and practical application evidently need to be further improved. It is not only important to reward good work and give it the public recognition it deserves. It is also necessary that the practice of material and moral incentives, combined with an efficient organisation of labour, should maintain and develop in people's minds an awareness that their efforts and the goods they produce are useful and necessary. It is necessary that this practice should eventually instil in the workers a feeling of involvement in the activities and plans of their collective, and of the entire people. And this feeling mobilises and disciplines better than any persuasion and exhortation.

In improving the distribution relations it is necessary to take into account the whole set of relationships involved in the work process. What is meant here is, first of all, the consistent consolidation in all spheres of the national economy of what Marx described as "regulation and order", which he considered to be forms of "social stability" of "a corresponding mode of production".* Administration by mere injunction and fuss and talk instead of action are especially harmful for work in this direction. A manager will not achieve much if he fails to realise this and if he tries to replace

systematic and persistent organisational efforts by showy but ineffective campaigns. The purpose of the Party's efforts to improve management and raise the level of organisation, efficiency, and discipline in matters of planning, and state and labour discipline, is not only to get rid of certain shortcomings and difficulties—which by itself is extremely important—but in the long run, to strengthen still further the foundations of the socialist way of life.

It goes without saying that in these matters the Party proceeds from the real conditions of labour management existing at the present stage of development of Soviet society. So far these conditions are such that the economic law which Marx considered the first law of communal production—the law of economy of labour time—is not yet operating here to the full. This is largely due to the great number of physically taxing, unattractive and monotonous jobs, and the slow rate at which they are being mechanised, let alone automated.

Meanwhile, it is enough to see how stretched the labour resources are and to see the demographic situation in the country for it to become clear that it is impermissible from an economic point of view to maintain the considerable share of manual, nonmechanised labour, which stands at 40 per cent in industry alone. This is why it is so meaningful today to accelerate scientific and technological progress to the utmost, more actively to use its achievements, first of all in those sections where labour expenditure is particularly high. And we do have the foundation for this. In the high level of the development of the socialist national economy. In the professional experience and skill of the Soviet working class. In the competent economic specialists and managers, a great scientific and intellectual potential whose productive force is becoming more and more significant in today's conditions. What is necessary now is to use all our potentialities better and faster, and to improve work efficiency and production organisation.

We must persistently tackle the tasks of mechanisation and automation of production because of their social and political significance as well. As a rule, people freed from strenuous, arduous manual labour show greater initiative and a more responsible attitude to their work. They get additional possibilities for study and recreation and participation in

social activity and production management. They can thus also more fully exercise the political and democratic rights granted to the working people by the socialist revolution—the rights of full masters of their society and their state.

Long before the society replacing capitalism began to emerge, Marx revealed the essence of the political forms of its life. The *Manifesto of the Communist Party* noted that "the first step in the revolution by the working class is to raise the proletariat to the position of ruling class, to win the battle of democracy".* The establishment of socialism is inconceivable without a firm political power, whose class content Marx summed up with the notion of "the dictatorship of the proletariat". According to Marx's teaching, it is this dictatorship which opens the road of political development ultimately leading to communist social self-government.

How does socialism's living history compare with these predictions by Marx?

In our country, just as in all the others where the working class and working people wield power, this has meant the triumph of democracy in the most precise and literal sense of the word—the genuine victory of people's power. The working people at last have the rights and freedoms which capitalism has always denied them, in essence, if not always formally.

Soviet democracy, which came up against particularly fierce resistance from counter-revolutionary forces, both internal and external, came into being honestly, without concealing its class character, not stopping short at legalising the privileges of the working people in relation to the members of the exploiter classes, who were fighting against the new power. Soviet democracy is and will always be in essence a democracy guaranteeing the broadest rights and protecting the working people's interest, a democracy prepared to discipline those who threaten the socialist gains of the people.

In the process of building the new society, the content of socialist democracy is enriched, the restrictions formed

historically wither away, and the forms of exercising the people's power become more varied. This process goes on in inseparable connection with the development of the socialist statehood, which itself undergoes qualitative changes, the most important of which is that the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat becomes a state of the whole people. This is a change of immense significance for the political system of socialism. It is reflected in the USSR Constitution adopted by the whole people in a constitution which lays the legislative basis for the further deepening of socialist democracy.

We do not idealise what has been and is being done in our country in this area. Soviet democracy has been experiencing and, it is to be supposed, is still going to experience, some difficulties caused by growing society's material possibilities, the level of consciousness and political maturity of the masses, and also by the fact that our society is not developing in a hothouse, in isolation from the world hostile to us, but in the cold winds of the "psychological war" unleashed by imperialism. Improvement of our democracy requires the elimination of bureaucratic "overorganisation" and formalism, of everything which dampens and undermines the initiative of the masses, shackles creative thinking and the activity of the working people. We have been fighting against these phenomena and will continue to do so with still greater energy and persistence.

It is sometimes claimed that the present character of socialist statehood and democracy is not in keeping with the perspective of communist self-government indicated by Marx. However, the road we have covered and the experience we have gained prove otherwise.

Take, for instance, Marx's ideas that it is the task of "the people, constituted in Communes" to govern the new society, that the essence of the new power is "a government of the people by the people".* It is well known that these ideas were suggested by life, by the heroic feat of the Paris Communards. Nevertheless, they contained only a very general indication of a remote goal. It is only the revolutionary creativity of the masses that could concretise the means of

nearing this goal. And on the eve of the October Revolution, the creativity of the masses provided the material which enabled Lenin to outline the practical step towards realisation of Marx's formulas in the conditions of our country: "*The people themselves,... united in the Soviets, must run the state.*"*

People who know no other power over them but the power of their own unity—this idea of Marx, Engels and Lenin is embodied in the activity of the Soviets, combining legislation, administration and control. It is manifested in the work of the trade unions and other public organisations, in the life of the work collectives and in the development of the entire political system of our society. And the point is not at all to seek distinctions between this system and the ideal of communist self-government (many such distinctions can be pointed out because of the historical distance separating us from the second phase of communism). What is much more important is that this system is functioning and is perfecting itself, finding ever new forms and methods to develop democracy, to widen the working man's economic rights and potentialities in production and in the entire socio-political practice—from the deputies' commissions and people's control to the standing production meetings. This is real socialist self-government of the people which is developing in the course of communist construction.

The experience of democratic development in accordance with the USSR's new Constitution needs to be given special attention and generalised. This applies first of all to the invigoration and ever wider encouragement of local initiative, and to the deeper involvement of all work collectives in our national affairs. The powers of the local Soviets with regard to the enterprises, institutions and organisations situated in the areas under their jurisdiction have widened substantially in recent years. The potentialities of the district, regional, territorial and republican (Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republics) Soviets will also increase with the implementation of the decisions of the May Plenary Meeting of the CPSU

Central Committee on the setting up of agroindustrial amalgamations under their authority. In this way the role of the representative organs in the exercise of the principal, managerial and organising, function of the socialist state is growing. One cannot but note the cost-accounting team, a primary form of production management evolved by the masses.

It goes without saying that an interpretation of self-government which leans towards anarcho-syndicalism, the splitting of society into rival corporations independent of each other, democracy without discipline, and the notion of rights without duties is deeply alien to us. The proven organisational principle of the entire life of socialist society is democratic centralism, which makes it possible successfully to combine the free creativity of the masses with the advantages of an integrated system of scientific guidance, planning and management.

The socialist system makes the exercise of the working people's collective rights and duties the mainspring of social progress, while by no means disregarding the interests of the individual. Our Constitution grants Soviet citizens broad rights and freedoms and at the same time underscores the priority of public interests, which it is the supreme manifestation of civic duty to serve.

The gap existing under capitalism between the interests of the state and of the citizen has been eliminated in our society. But, unfortunately, there are still people who try to oppose their selfish interests to the interests of society, of its other members. It is becoming clear that it is necessary to educate, sometimes to re-educate, some persons, and to combat encroachments on socialist law and order and on norms of our collectivist life. And this is not "flouting of human rights", on which bourgeois propaganda hypocritically harps, but real humanism and democracy, which mean government by the will of the majority and in the interests of all the working people.

The CPSU places the interests of the people, the interests of society as a whole, above everything else. It devotes day-to-day attention to providing conditions that stimulate the creative activities of the working people, and give the industrial enterprises and the state farms and collective farms

more independence. This active attitude and initiative underlies the feasibility of the Party's plans, the growth of its strength and, in the final analysis, a guarantee that the programme of communist construction will be implemented.

As the nucleus of Soviet society's political system, the Party sets an example of democratic organisation of all its activities: it elaborates and develops democratic principles, which enter all the spheres of our socialist life. This is one of the most important manifestations of the Party's guiding role in the life of society, its inspiring influence on the masses.

In his time, while analysing the Marxian methodological approach to defining the main features of the new society, Lenin wrote: "There is no trace of an attempt on Marx's part to make up a utopia, to indulge in the idle guess-work about what cannot be known.... Instead of scholastically invented, 'concocted' definitions and fruitless disputes over words (What is socialism? What is communism?), Marx gives an analysis of what might be called the stages of the economic maturity of communism."*. It is on the basis of such an analysis that Marx, as is well known, created his teaching of the two stages in the development of the single communist formation, a teaching which the CPSU and other fraternal parties use. It is on this basis that Lenin generalised the new historical experience and comprehensively developed the theory of the construction of socialism and communism. Today, too, we use these propositions as our point of departure in resolving one of the questions which Marx, Engels and Lenin considered the most difficult—that of the concrete forms of transition to communism.

The most important features of present-day Soviet society are reflected in the concept of developed socialism. This concept convincingly shows the dialectical unity of real successes in socialist construction, in the carrying out of the many economic, social and cultural tasks of the first phase of communism, the growing sprouts of a communist future, and

the problems outstanding from yesterday. This means that it will take time to make up for the lag and move ahead. We must have a sober idea of where we are. To run ahead means to put forward unfeasible tasks; to be content with what has been achieved means to fail to use everything at our disposal. What is now required is to see the real pattern of our society's growth, with all its potentialities and needs.

In reviewing what had been done in the field of Marxist-Leninist theory in recent years, the 26th Congress of the CPSU gave prominence to the elaboration of the concept of developed socialism. Relying on this concept, the Party determined its strategy and tactics for the coming years and for the more distant future, and warned against possible exaggerations of the extent to which our country has neared the highest phase of communism. All this enables us to clarify and concretise how and when we can attain our programmatic aims.

Tasks of great magnitude are arising before the Party and the people in the closing decades of the 20th century. Taken together, these tasks are reducible to what could be described as the perfecting of developed socialism, in the course of which the gradual transition to communism will take place. Our country is at the beginning of this long historical stage, which in turn, will naturally have its own periods and its stages of growth. Only experience and practice will show how long they will last and what concrete forms they will take. But one of the major, one could say, qualitative reference points on this road was clearly indicated by the Party's 26th Congress, which put forward a proposition on the formation of a basically classless structure of society within the historical framework of developed socialism.

It is characteristic that this conclusion, made on the basis of practice, echoes Marx's understanding of socialism as a society which knows no class differences.* This, by the way, is fresh confirmation of the fact that the validity of Marx's views should be judged not on the basis of the experience of the last few decades but should also be assessed from the positions of a longer perspective.

* See K. Marx, "Critique of the Gotha Programme", in K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 3, p. 18.

The person who asks himself, "What is socialism?" and turns for the answer first of all to the works of Marx, Engels and Lenin, is doing the right thing. But he should not stop there. Today the concept "socialism" cannot be fully understood without taking into account the very rich practical experience of the peoples of the Soviet Union and other fraternal countries. This experience shows that many of the problems arising on the road of socialist construction are complicated. But it also testifies to the fact that only socialism is able to solve the most difficult questions of social reality.

It is socialism that removes the age-old barriers separating labour and culture and creates a very firm alliance of the workers, peasants and intelligentsia, of all manual and mental workers, with the working class playing the leading role. It brings the achievements of science, technology, literature and art within the reach of the working masses and ensures unprecedented public recognition of the creative activities of the intelligentsia. It is socialism that rallies into a close-knit family the peoples that were formerly divided by national strife and provides a just solution to the nationalities question, which is engendered by the exploiter system. It is socialism that, while facilitating the flourishing of the national forms of life, also creates a new type of international, interstate relations, which exclude inequality and are based on fraternal cooperation and mutual assistance.

With the completion of the period of transition from capitalism to socialism and with the consolidation of the new socialist way of life, the sharpest social confrontations in society are overcome, confrontations which are based, in the final analysis, on society's division into hostile classes. However, this conclusion has nothing in common with the simplistic and politically naive idea that socialism gets rid of every single contradiction and difference and of all trouble in everyday life. Incidentally, our ideological opponents also exploit this idea in their own way when they cast aspersions on the new system, pointing out that here, too, there are both difficulties and disappointments in people's lives and sometimes a very difficult struggle between the new and the old.

Yes, we have both contradictions and difficulties. To think there can be some other course of development would mean

turning aside from the reliable, though sometimes rough, ground of reality, would mean departing from the ABC of Marxist dialectics. Lenin elucidated this question theoretically on the basis of the Marxist teaching. "Antagonism and contradiction," he wrote, "are not at all one and the same thing. The former will disappear, the latter will remain under socialism."* Now this tenet has been confirmed by practice. It does not follow from this, however, that one can disregard or ignore non-antagonistic contradictions in politics. Life teaches us that even those contradictions which are not by their nature antagonistic can cause serious collisions if disregarded. Another—and the most important—aspect of the matter is correct use of socialism's contradictions as a source and stimulus of its onward development.

Our experience shows that successes in socialist construction come when the policy of the ruling Communist Party rests on a sound scientific foundation. Any underestimation of the role of Marxist-Leninist science and its creative development, any narrow pragmatic interpretation of its aims or disregard of the fundamental problems of theory, any imposition of opportunistic demands or scholastic theorising can have serious political and ideological consequences. Experience and practice have repeatedly confirmed that Lenin was right in saying that "anybody who tackles partial problems without having previously settled general problems, will inevitably and at every step 'come up against' those general problems without himself realising it. To come up against them blindly in every individual case means to doom one's politics to the worst vacillation and lack of principle".**

The CPSU attaches great significance to development of the theory of Marxism-Leninism, as its very creative essence demands. This is vitally important in solving our practical tasks. For example, we increasingly feel the need for serious research into the political economy of socialism. And here Marx's *Capital* has always set our science a shining example of deep insight into the essence of the phenomena of economic life.

The multifaceted and not always identical experience of the fraternal socialist countries provides vast material for theoretical interpretation. In this connection one cannot but recall Lenin's words to the effect that "only by a series of attempts—each of which, taken by itself, will be one-sided and will suffer from certain inconsistencies—will complete socialism be created by the revolutionary co-operation of the proletarians of *all* countries".* Nowadays the task is being tackled in practice over vast areas of the globe, in the framework of the world system of socialism, which has become the decisive factor of mankind's social progress. And it is being tackled in the basic direction foreseen by Marx.

Lenin often said that he constantly collated all his activities with Marx. It is with Marx, Engels and Lenin that the CPSU collates its every step.

To collate current activities with Marx, with Marxism-Leninism, does not at all mean mechanically to "compare" life in progress with this or that formula. We would be worthless followers of our teachers if we were content simply to repeat the truths they discovered and rely on the magic power of quotations once learnt by heart.

Marxism is not a dogma but an effective guide to action, to independent work on the complex tasks which every new turn in history sets before us. And to be able to keep pace with life, the Communists should carry forward and enrich the teaching of Marx in all directions, and creatively apply in practice his method of materialist dialectics, which is justifiably described as the living soul of Marxism. It is this attitude to our invaluable ideological heritage, an example of which Lenin set, and this continuous self-renewal of revolutionary theory under the impact of revolutionary practice that make Marxism the real science and art of revolutionary creativity. In this lies the secret of the force of Marxism-Leninism, its unfading freshness.

It is sometimes said that the new phenomena in social life "do not fit in" with the concept of Marxism-Leninism, that it

* V. I. Lenin, "'Left-wing' Childishness and the Petty-Bourgeois Mentality" *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 346.

is in "crisis" and should be "revived" with ideas drawn from Western sociology, philosophy or political science. The problem, however, is not at all an alleged "crisis" of Marxism; it is something else—the inability of some self-styled Marxist theorists to appreciate the true scope of the theoretical thinking of Marx, Engels and Lenin, and to use the tremendous intellectual power of their teaching when making a concrete study of concrete questions. It would not be superfluous to add that many bourgeois philosophers, sociologists and political economists have earned a name for themselves largely by twisting Marxist ideas to suit themselves.

It is unworthy of Communists to be attracted by the trenchant phrases of all sorts of "perfectors" of Marxism and to clutch at the fabrications of bourgeois science. Not the erosion of the Marxist-Leninist teaching but, on the contrary, a struggle for its purity and creative development—such is the path to the cognition and solution of new problems. Only this approach is in keeping with the traditions and spirit of our teaching and the requirements of the communist movement.

We, the Soviet Communists, are proud of belonging to Marxism-Leninism, the most influential ideological current in the entire history of world civilisation. Open to all the best and most advanced in modern science and culture, today it is in the centre of the world's intellectual life, it has won the minds of millions upon millions of people. It is the ideological credo of the rising class, which is liberating all of mankind. It is the philosophy of social optimism, the philosophy of the present and the future.

The world has now travelled a long distance along the road of its social renewal, along the road of realisation of the revolutionary goals and ideals of the working class. The political map of the world has taken on a new appearance. Science has made momentous discoveries; the technological advances are astounding. At the same time, mankind has many new problems, including some very complicated ones. Its concern about the worsening raw materials, energy, food, and other global problems is well-grounded. And the main thing of concern to the peoples today is the need to preserve peace, to avert a thermonuclear catastrophe. There is nothing more important than this on the international plane for our

Party, the Soviet Government and all the nations of the world.

To gain an understanding of all the complexities of the modern world and organise and direct the revolutionary socio-historical creativity of the working class and all the working people—such is the great task which the theory of Marxism-Leninism and the practice of the struggle for mankind's progress are tackling today, the task which Karl Marx set himself and his ideological and political associates and followers: to interpret and change the world.

Glossary

A

ABSOLUTE DETERIORATION OF THE PROLETARIAT'S STATUS—decline in workers' living standard under capitalism due to drop in wages, price rise and growing unemployment.

ABSOLUTE IDEA—in Hegel's idealistic philosophy, basic concept meaning perpetual, infinite fundamental principle of the universe.

ABSOLUTE RENT—an income received by a landowner from leasing a land plot to a capitalist who organises farming. A source of absolute rent is the additional surplus value created by the unpaid labour of agricultural workers.

ABSOLUTE SURPLUS VALUE—a kind of surplus value produced by lengthening the working day. Hence more time is spent by the worker performing his or her assignment for which the capitalist does not pay: a way of intensifying the worker's exploitation by capitalists.

ABSOLUTE TRUTH—knowledge that fully exhausts the subject under study and one that cannot be refuted in subsequent cognising process.

ABSTRACT LABOUR—expenditure of vital forces (energy, muscles, nerves, and so on) by all workers in manufacturing various commodities.

ABSTRACTION—a concept that forms in the process of intellectual withdrawal from inessential aspects of a phenomenon giving prominence to the substantial ones.

ACCUMULATION OF CAPITAL—growth of capital at the expense of capitalists's surplus value (income).

ADMINISTER—1. to govern, to manage; 2. to administer bureaucratically by mere injunction.

ADVENTURISM—irresponsible behaviour reckoned on chance success.

AGITATION—dissemination of political ideas to influence the minds and sentiments of people.

AGNOSTICISM—philosophical doctrine claiming that nothing is known or knowable.

AGRICULTURAL COMMUNES—in Soviet Russia during the transitional period from capitalism to socialism, one of the types of farming co-operatives, where all the means of production (buildings, small implements, cattle) and land use are socialised and where consumption and everyday services are based on socialised economy. These co-operatives existed only for a short period of time, since they did not combine personal and public interests and failed to stimulate the peasants' material interest in the results of their labour.

AGROINDUSTRIAL COMPLEX—aggregate of branches of industry and farming connected with production and supply of food products and consumer goods.

ALBIGENSES—participants in heretic movement in southern France in the 12th-13th centuries; departed from dominant Catholic religion.

ALIENATION OF LABOUR—under capitalism, transformation of material conditions and capitalist-appropriated results of a hired worker's labour into a force of enslaving and oppressing the working man.

ALIZARIN—a chemically produced dye (used in dying fabrics in red or other colours).

ANACHRONISM—anything incongruous in point of time with its surroundings.

ANARCHISM—petty-bourgeois teaching rejecting all state authority, organised political struggle, and the working-class party's leading role.

ANARCHO-SYNDICALISM—petty-bourgeois teaching rejecting political struggle, political party and state authority of the working class. Recognises trade unions as supreme and sole form of proletariat's organisation, and various kinds of economic struggle (strikes, etc.) as the only means for combatting the bourgeoisie.

ANGLO-ICAN CHURCH—state Church in England established in 16th century; one of the existing Protestant churches.

ANTAGONISM—contrariety characterised by irreconcilable struggle of hostile forces, tendencies, classes.

ANTAGONISTIC—irreconcilably hostile.

ANTI-COMMUNISM—the' ideology and policy of the imperialist bourgeoisie hostile to communist theory and practice, distorting the objectives and policies of Communist Parties and the Marxist-Leninist teaching and slanderous of socialism.

ANTI-LABOUR LEGISLATION—enactment by bourgeois state of laws that either ban or restrict workers' struggle for their economic and social rights.

ANTIQUE—relating to the history and culture of Ancient Greece and Ancient Rome.

APOLOGETICS—biased discourse in defense of something instead of truthful reasoning.

APPARATUS—totality of bodies of administration or management (with the state—the army, police, court, etc.).

ARISTOCRACY—privileged (enjoying special advantages) élite of some class or social group.

ART—component part of human spiritual culture, e.g. painting, music, theatre, fiction, etc.

ASIAN MODE OF PRODUCTION—first introduced by Marx, it presumes running the economy in an agricultural commune based on communal ownership of land, common labour, and other relationships among its members. Was most developed in ancient Eastern civilisations during the collapse of primitive communal society and prior to the establishment of slave-owning system. In India and some East European nations, existed till 19th century.

ATHEIST—one who rejects belief in the supernatural (gods, religious miracles, etc.) and whose world outlook is essentially based on scientific materialism.

AUCTION—a public sale of property to the highest bidder.

AUSTROPHILE—one who greatly admires everything connected with the Austrian nation.

AUTHORITARIAN—favouring complete submission to authority.

AUTHORITY—1. commonly accepted significance, influence; 2. one who enjoys general recognition and influence.

AUTOMATION—development of machines and other technical devices operating without direct participation of man.

AVERAGE RATE OF PROFIT—under capitalism, equal income (profit) for all equivalent capital invested by capitalists, irrespective of the economic sector in which it is used.

B

BALANCE—totality of indices characterising some phenomenon by comparing or contrasting its individual aspects; for instance, the foreign trade balance shows the amount of goods sold abroad and bought there.

BANK—an establishment in which money (accounts) are concentrated and granted for temporary use to people or enterprises in the form of credits (loans, advance-money) for definite interest.

BANKRUPTCY—insolvency, refusal to pay one's debts because of lack of funds; ruin.

BASIS—a concept of historical materialism; economic system of society embodying the totality of relationships between people engaged in production.

BEING—reality, e.g., nature, existing independent of human consciousness.

BERNE INTERNATIONAL.—international organisation founded in 1919 at conference in Berne, Switzerland, by leaders of several Social-Democratic parties pursuing the policy and professing the ideology of social-chauvinism and opportunism.

BIOLOGY—science about living nature (plants, animals, human beings).

BLACK-HUNDREDERS—in early-20th-century Russia, members of reactionary public organisations. Defended autocratic, feudal system; advocated the superiority of the Russian nation over all other nations and organised pogroms, violent actions against revolutionaries.

BLOCKADE—measures (military, economic, etc.) used in war or international conflicts by one of the sides to deprive the other side of communications with other countries.

BOLSHEVIKS, BOLSHEVISM—revolutionary Marxist trend in international working-class movement. Bolshevism appeared in early 20th century in Russia in the form of a new type of proletarian party founded by Lenin, viz. the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

BOND—a type of security (promissory note) due to be paid by government to an individual holder, who in addition receives a pre-fixed amount of interest.

BOURGEOIS REVOLUTION—a revolution involving the destruction of the feudal system and the establishment of bourgeois authority. In many colonial countries such a revolution brings about national independence.

BOURGEOIS (CAPITALIST) SYSTEM—a totality of relationships among people based on the dominance of the bourgeoisie in society. An antagonistic system involving perpetual class struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat.

BOURGEOISIE—under capitalism, dominant class owning the means of production and enriching itself by appropriating part of the labour of wage workers and by robbing the people of economically underdeveloped countries.

BONUS—a sum of money or some other material benefit granted or given to an employee for some special success or services in any field of human endeavour.

BUDGET—itemised statement of the incomes and expenditure of a state, enterprise or individual for some specified period.

BUREAUCRACY—1. administration with which the nucleus of executive power (administration, officials, police) is alienated from other members of society and fails to fulfil their will; 2. red tape.

BURGHERDOM—in medieval times, townspeople in Western Europe.

C

CALVINISM—a Protestant faith propounded by Calvin in the 16th century.

CAPITAL—sum of money which the capitalist spends to buy the means of production and labour for obtaining profit (income).

CAPITULATOR—a person who treacherously backs away from difficulties; one who betrays a common cause.

CAREERISM—pursuit of success in professional or other fields to gain personal welfare.

CARTEL—an amalgamation of capitalist entrepreneurs who agree on the scale of production, on commodity markets and prices, and so on. At the same time, capitalist enterprises retain their production and commercial independence.

CARTELISE—to combine industrial enterprises in a cartel.

CASSOCK—street-clothes of Orthodox clergy.

"CATEGORICAL IMPERATIVE"—in the teaching of German philosopher Kant, a universal compulsory principle (basic tenet) of behaviour, binding on all people irrespective of their origin, status, etc.

CATEGORY—1. class or group of items, phenomena, people with any common features; 2. general notion expressing the most substantial properties and relations of items and phenomena, e.g. quantity, quality, time, motion.

CATHOLICISM—a basic trend in Christianity; resulted from split between Christian churches in the 11th century A.D.

CAUSE—a phenomenon whose action evokes or entails another phenomenon (consequence).

CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION (CPSU CC)—supreme body of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union inbetween party congresses, which elect it. CPSU Central Committee plenary meetings are periodically convened. The CPSU Central Committee elects from among its membership a Politbureau, Secretariat, and General Secretary. The CPSU Central Committee is the body of the Party's political leadership, its theoretical and ideological centre.

CENTRALISATION OF CAPITAL—growth of capital resulting from pooling a number of capitals or from absorption of one capital by another.

CHAIR—in higher educational establishment, a group of instructors and

researchers who study and spread knowledge on any one or several closely related sciences.

CHARACTER OF LABOUR—major distinctive features of socially organised labour in a given society. For example, under socialism, the distinctive feature is free labour of all able-bodied citizens for themselves and for society.

CHARTISTS—supporters of Chartism, mass revolutionary movement of English workers in the mid-1830s-early 1850s. The workers protested against capitalist oppression. With growth of reformist tendencies, Chartism disappeared from the historical scene.

CHAUVINISM—a policy advocating national exclusiveness and aimed at inciting national enmity and hatred.

CHRISTIANITY—one of the most widespread world religions. Appeared at the beginning of the 1st century; named after Christ, its mythical founder.

CHURCH—1. special type of religious organisation; an association of followers of a given religious trend based on a common dogma and cult; 2. in the Christian religion, a building designed for public worship.

CIRCULATION—exchange of one commodity for another by means of money through sale and purchase.

CIVIL CODE—a law that contains definitely systematised basic rules of behaviour in conformity with civil law.

CIVIL LAW—a branch of law that regulates the compulsory rules of human behaviour and the property and related non-property relationships between citizens (e.g., deals involving purchase and sale of commodities).

CIVIL WAR—armed struggle for state power between classes and social groups inside one country (for example, peasant wars or an armed struggle of the people against an exploiter government).

CIVILISATION—a level of social development, of material and spiritual culture attained by people in a given historical epoch (period of time).

CLAN—in Scotland and Ireland, a tribal community.

CLASS STRUGGLE—struggle between classes whose interests are either incompatible or contradictory. Principal motive force in the history of all societies based on exploitation and enslavement of man by man.

CLASSES (social): large groups of persons differing from each other mainly in their position in production (as regards the appropriation of the means of production, organisation of production process, and distribution of products). In slave-owning, feudal and bourgeois societies, the ruling classes exploit and oppress peoples dependent on them.

CLASSICAL ANTIQUITY—history and culture of Ancient Greece and Ancient Rome.

CLASSICAL BOURGEOIS POLITICAL ECONOMY—a trend in bourgeois economic thought that put down the beginnings of political economy as a science which undertook to study economic relations under capitalism. This trend was developed by Petty, Smith and Ricardo in England, by Buisguillebert, Quesnay, and Turgot in France, and by Sismondi in Switzerland. All of them regarded capitalist economy as everlasting and corresponding to human "nature". Those of their ideas that were correct were used by Marx and served as an ideological source of Marxism for creating a truly scientific political economy.

CLASSICAL FRENCH MATERIALISM—materialist doctrines developed in the 18th century by French philosophers LaMettrie, Helvetius, Diderot, Holbach, and others. Ideological source of Marxism.

CLASSICAL GERMAN PHILOSOPHY—a period in the development of German philosophy (late 18th—first half of the 19th centuries) involving the creation of a successive series of idealist philosophical doctrines (Kant, Fichte, Schelling, Hegel) and Feuerbach's materialist teaching, an ideological source of Marxism.

CLERGY—in modern religions, ministers of religion, persons professionally engaged in performing religious rites.

CLERICALISM—political trend widely using religion and the Church to increasingly influence all spheres of social life in capitalist countries in the interests of the bourgeoisie.

COLLECTIVE FARM—in the USSR, co-operative organisation of peasants who have voluntarily united for joint management of their commonly owned economy.

COLLECTIVE FARM-AND-CO-OPERATIVE PROPERTY—under socialism, joint ownership of the means of production and the collective produce of peasants who have united in production and trade co-operatives.

COLONIAL SYSTEM OF IMPERIALISM—an aggregate of antagonistic relations between imperialist states and the peoples of the countries whom they have enslaved. This system formed in the 20th century following the territorial partition of the world between the major imperialist powers. By the 1970s, the colonial system of imperialism had, in the main, collapsed in view of the changed alignment of forces in favour of socialism and because of the intensified national liberation struggle.

COLONIALISM—political, economic and spiritual enslavement of countries (as a rule, less developed socially and economically) by the ruling classes of exploiter states.

COLONY—country or territory deprived of independence and ruled by a foreign state.

COMMODITY—the product of labour manufactured for sale in the market.

COMMUNE—1. in medieval Western Europe, a municipal community that won the right to self-government; 2. a group of people, united for joint life on egalitarian principles involving common property and labour.

COMMUNISM—the social and economic structure (social system) based on public ownership of the means of production coming up to replace capitalism; a phase higher than socialism. Characteristic features of communism: absence of all classes, the means of production belong to the whole people, complete social equality, and work for the public benefit as the primary vital need of each individual. A high level of production and communist consciousness would allow people to achieve the basic communist principle: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs". Public self-government would replace the state.

COMMUNIST COMMUNE—a primitive type of human social organisation based on natural, blood relationships: single production, family, and cult collective.

COMMUNIST LABOUR—voluntary and free labour for the benefit of society, labour that has turned into a primary vital human necessity, i.e.,

habitual work for the common benefit like any requirement of a healthy human organism.

COMMUNIST PARTY—a political organisation expressing the interests of the working class and leading its struggle for extermination of capitalism and creation of a socialist and communist society.

COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION (CPSU)—a revolutionary party of Russia's proletariat founded by V. I. Lenin at the turn of the 20th century. Former names: Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party, Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party (Bolsheviks); since CPSU. After a socialist society was built in the USSR, the CPSU unites, on a voluntary basis, the progressive and most class-conscious sections of Soviet workers, peasants and intellectuals. The CPSU is the leading and guiding force of Soviet society, an inseparable component part of the international communist and working-class movement.

COMMUNIST SUBBOTNIKS IN THE USSR—voluntary, gratuitous work by Soviet working people on days-off for the benefit of society, something that characterises their communist attitude towards labour.

COMMUNITY—an association of people based on collective ownership of the means of production and complete or partial self-government, e.g., family, tribal, or farming communities.

COMPANY—in capitalist countries, an industrial, commercial, transport, or any other similar association of capitalists.

COMPENSATED EXPROPRIATION—confiscation of property belonging to one social class by another by paying redemption to the owners.

COMPETITION—rivalry of private commodity producers (peasants, handcraftsmen) for more profitable conditions of production and sales; under capitalism, fierce contest between capitalists for obtaining maximum profit (income).

COMPLEX—an aggregate of items, phenomena or properties constituting a single whole.

COMPROMISE—an agreement reached through mutual concessions.

CONCENTRATION OF CAPITAL—increase of capital due to capitalist's profit (income).

CONCENTRATION OF PRODUCTION—increased amassment of production at large enterprises.

CONCESSION—1. an agreement for lease by the state to private entrepreneurs or foreign firms (amalgamations of capitalists) of industrial enterprises or land plots with the right to produce commodities, mine minerals, build various structures, etc.; 2. any enterprise organised on the basis of such an agreement.

CONFISCATION—forcible and gratuitous expropriation of property, land and/or money from private owners in favour of the state.

CONGLOMERATE—mechanical combining of anything heterogeneous; a random mixture.

CONSCIOUSNESS—man's ability to ideally reproduce in his mind the surrounding reality existing beyond and independent of him.

CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY—in Russia, a parliamentary institution convened at the end of 1917; came out against the socialist revolution.

CONSTITUTION—fundamental law (or totality of most important state laws) of supreme legal force which secures a country's political and economic

system, the fundamental organisations and activities of state administration bodies, the order and principles of forming representative government bodies, and the basic rights, freedoms, and duties of citizens.

CONTRADICTION—in dialectics, the unity and interaction of opposite, antagonistic aspects and tendencies in all subjects and phenomena; the source of development of all being.

CO-OPERATIVE—an association of people for joint production, marketing, purchase and consumption of commodities or services, and construction and use of residential buildings, etc. For example, farming co-operative.

CORPORATION—a group of people with common professional or class interests.

COSMOPOLITISM—reactionary bourgeois ideology advocating renunciation of national sovereignty (complete independence), national traditions and culture in the name of abstractly understood “unity of the human race”, “unity of states”.

COST ACCOUNTING—under socialism, a method of planned management of socialist economy; order of work at enterprises, under which they use the returns from sale of products to cover their own expenditures. Part of the profit (income) is used for the needs of the employees.

COST OF PRODUCTION—in capitalist economy, the price of sold goods which forms as a result of free competition (rivalry) of capitalists from various production sectors. Includes expenditure on manufacturing goods and equal profit (income) for equivalent capital for all capitalists.

COUNCIL FOR MUTUAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE (CMEA)—an interstate economic organisation of socialist countries established in speed up their scientific, technological, and economic development, to level out their economies, to promote continuous growth of their labour productivity, and to improve the welfare of the member-nations (Bulgaria, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the GDR, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, the USSR, Vietnam). Any country who shares the Council's principles and wishes to take part in extensive economic co-operation with the member-countries is eligible for joining it.

COUNTER-REVOLUTION—active opposition to revolution; struggle of any class, already overthrown or being overthrown by a revolution, aimed at restoring an obsolete social and state system.

COUPON—a portion of a security (bond or share) which is cut off and given instead of a receipt for incomes.

CRACOW UPRISE OF 1846—uprising in Cracow, Poland, against Austrian domination and the feudal system, for national liberation of the Polish people. Suppressed by Austrian and tsarist Russian troops.

CREDIT—loaned commodities or money.

CREDITOR—loan giver (organisation, enterprise, or individual) who provides something on trust.

CREDO—conviction, views, principles of world outlook.

CRITICISM (or critical philosophy)—the philosophy of the German idealist philosopher Immanuel Kant, who believed that man cannot cognize nature.

CULT—a compulsory component part of any religion, involving special magic rites and actions by the priests and believers.

CULTURE—the totality of material and spiritual values created by

human society and characterising a definite level of its development. Material culture (machines, engineering structures, dwellings, etc.) is distinguished from spiritual culture (human thought, cognition, works of art, etc.).

CUSTOM-HOUSE—a state institution which controls passage of cargo across state frontiers.

CYCLE—a totality of interrelated phenomena and processes which form a finalised round of development over a given period of time. Under capitalism, a cyclical movement of capitalist production from one economic crisis of overproduction to another.

D

DAILY VALUE OF LABOUR—value of worker's means of subsistence (food, clothes, etc) he, on the average, needs daily to restore his working capacity and support his family.

DECLASSED ELEMENT—someone who has lost connection with his class, takes no part in socially beneficial activity, is morally degraded and ideologically degenerated.

DECREE—a supreme power enactment valid as law.

DEDUCTION—reasoning from the general to the particular, or from the universal to the individual. The opposite method—induction—implies reasoning from the particular to the individual. Both methods are used in logic.

DEIST—a follower of a religious-philosophical teaching widespread in Europe in the 17th and 18th centuries, according to which God was the creator of the world, but did not take part in the further self-motion of nature and society.

DEMAGOGY—use of false promises and flattery to achieve one's political aims (for example, to win over votes during elections to bourgeois government bodies).

DEMOCRACY—government by the people; a political system under which the methods and forms of democracy and the civil freedoms and equities secured in the laws are guaranteed and implemented. Bourgeois democracy is characterised by a disparity between the formally proclaimed power of the people and the actual dominance of the minority, the bourgeoisie. In socialist society, there is an actual government by the people, genuine democracy for all the working people; socialist laws not only secure but guarantee civil freedoms and equal rights.

DEMOCRATIC CENTRALISM—the organisational principle of Communist and Workers' parties. Implies electivity of leading bodies from bottom to top, their periodic accountability, subordination of the minority to the majority, and the binding nature of the resolutions of higher for lower bodies. Democratic centralism also underlies the organisation of the state apparatus, economic bodies, and all public organisations in the USSR and other socialist countries.

DEVELOPED SOCIALISM—in the USSR, the currently achieved higher stage in the first phase of the communist socio-economic formation. Developed socialism is also being built in several socialist countries. It is distinguished by highly developed productive forces and production relations and by fully established collectivist foundations of socialism. At this level, the advantages of socialism are realised in all respects: people's requirements

become increasingly satisfied, and prerequisites are created for their comprehensive development.

DIALECTICS—a science on the most general laws of development of nature, society and thought. It reveals the intrinsic source of any development, i.e., the unity and struggle of opposites.

DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT—state power of the working class as established during a socialist revolution. Is used for achieving the victory of that revolution, for suppressing the overthrown exploiter classes, and for building socialism and defending the revolution from attempts by the international bourgeoisie to restore capitalism. Dictatorship of the proletariat is not only coercion of the exploiters and not even chiefly coercion; its main task is, in effect, constructive, namely to build a socialist society and to implement the most complete democracy for all the working people.

DIFFERENTIAL RENT—the excess profit of the landowner from leasing a land plot to the capitalist. This plot is most fertile and better located in relation to the market. The source of differential rent is the excess surplus value created by the unpaid labour of agricultural workers.

DIFFERENTIATION—separation or dismemberment of an integral whole into different parts, forms, e.g. class differentiation.

DISCIPLINE—subordination to a firmly established order compulsory for all members of a given collective.

DISCRIMINATION—act of restricting some citizens' rights or depriving them of these rights because of their race or nationality, sex, or political views and creed.

DISTILLATION—separation of liquid mixtures into portions differing in composition.

DIVISION OF LABOUR—setting apart of various types of labour activity. We distinguish division of labour within society by kinds of production (industry and agriculture), by types of production (mining and processing industry, vegetable growing and cattle breeding), by respective territories (by territorial economic regions), and within given enterprises (between its individual units and/or between workers of different trades and specialities).

DOCENT—learned title and position of instructor at Soviet higher educational establishment.

DOCTRINE—teaching: scientific or philosophical theory; guiding theoretical or political tenet.

DOGMA—a tenet that is taken for irrefutable truth without accounting for changing life conditions.

DOGMATISM—a way of thinking based on dogmas, immutable concepts and tenets that do not account for changing life conditions. Dogmatism contradicts the creative nature of Marxism-Leninism and leads to "Left-wing" and right-wing opportunism.

E

ECLECTICISM—absence of integrity in convictions, theories: a combination of heterogeneous, incompatible views.

ECOLOGY—1. a section of biology (a science of living nature) which studies the relations between animals, plants, microorganisms and the

environment; 2. social ecology: a section of sociology which examines the relations between man and environment.

ECONOMIC CRISIS OF OVERPRODUCTION—under capitalism, periodic overproduction of commodities in amounts that cannot be sold because of the population's relatively low incomes. Chiefly caused by the main capitalist contradiction between the social nature of production and the private way of appropriating material wealth.

ECONOMIC ESSENCE OF IMPERIALISM—domination of capitalist monopolies (unions of big capitalists).

ECONOMIC LAW—a law that governs production, distribution and exchange of material wealth. It expresses the substantial and necessary ties between economic phenomena which are independent of human consciousness. For example, if in bourgeois society the national economy belongs to private capitalist owners, their relations develop by the law of competition (fierce rivalry).

ECONOMIC MECHANISM—the funds, forms and methods of economic management used to achieve the aforeset objectives. Under socialism, the economic mechanism involves planning and organisation of production, cost accounting, and drawing the working people into management of national economy.

ECONOMIC PARTITION OF THE WORLD—under imperialism, partition of world markets (markets of raw materials and fuel and markets for sale of manufactured products) achieved by international monopolies (unions of capitalists from different countries) to obtain maximum incomes by robbing and exploiting the peoples of economically underdeveloped countries.

ECONOMIC (PRODUCTION) RELATIONS—human social relations in the course of production, exchange, and distribution of products. The existence of private or public ownership of the means of production plays a determining role in the system of these relations.

ECONOMISTS—an opportunist trend in Russian Social-Democracy in late 19th-early 20th centuries; Economists strived to limit the tasks of the working-class movement to economic struggle (improvement of working conditions, raising wages, etc.) and denied political struggle and the leading role of the working-class' party in revolution.

ECONOMY—1. the economy of a region, country, group of countries, or of the whole world, 2. the totality of relationships between people in the course of production: society's economic base.

EMANCIPATION—liberation from dependence and/or oppression; abolition of limitations, equalisation of rights. Emancipation of women: granting them equal opportunities in social, professional, and family life.

EMBRYOLOGY—a science that studies the development of plant, animal, and human embryos.

EMPIRICAL—based on experience.

EMPIRIO-CRITICISM—late-19th-century subjective-idealistic philosophical trend which denied the actual existence of the material world and regarded things as products of the mind, the totality of human sensations.

ENLIGHTENMENT: in 18th-century Europe, a progressive ideological trend during the transition from feudalism to capitalism. Connected with the struggle of the nascent bourgeoisie and the popular masses against feudalism.

political despotism, and class privileges. Served as ideological precursor for several bourgeois revolutions.

ENLIGHTENMENT LITERATURE—in the 18th century, the political and philosophical literature expressing the ideology of the Enlightenment.

EPOCH—in the development of nature, society, science, etc., a period of time characterised by specific features.

ESSENCE—an object's intrinsic content manifesting itself in the unity of all its multiform properties and relationships (e.g., the essence of relations between the capitalist and the hired worker is gratuitous appropriation by the capitalist of a significant portion of the worker's labour).

ESTATE—in pre-capitalist societies, a social group possessing inherited rights and duties secured by custom or law, for example, in India estates exist in the form of definite castes.

EQUIVALENT—in economics, a commodity which expresses the value of another commodity or of other commodities, an equivalent commodity.

EVOLUTION—change, development.

EVOLUTIONISM—a bourgeois or reformist theory regarding development solely as gradual quantitative change. Denies the role of fundamental, qualitative, revolutionary transformations in society.

EXCEPTIONAL LAW AGAINST SOCIALISTS—in Germany (1878-1890) a law under which workers' organisations were disbanded, the working-class movement's activists taken into custody, and the Social-Democratic press closed down.

EXCHANGE—an institution that sells and buys securities (stock exchange), currency (currency exchange), samples of consumer goods (commodity exchange) or hands (labour exchange).

EXCHANGE RATE—value of a country's monetary unit expressed in monetary units of other countries.

EXCHANGE VALUE—quantitative ratio to which various commodities are exchanged in the market.

EXPLOITATION—appropriation of somebody's labour products by private owners of the means of production.

EXPORT OF CAPITAL—1. investment of capital abroad for obtaining maximum profit (income). 2. transfer of capital from one country to another for obtaining greater profit.

EXPORT OF COMMODITIES—export of goods from a given country for their subsequent sale or use in other countries.

EXPORT OF COUNTER-REVOLUTION—forcible interference by imperialist states in the internal affairs of any country in order to suppress socialist revolution or national liberation struggle.

EXPROPRIATION—forcible (gratuitous or paid) deprivation of property of one social class by another. For example, nationalisation of the property of foreign monopolies in many developing countries.

EXPROPRIATION OF EXPROPRIATORS—confiscation of the means of production from the bourgeoisie, which, with the emergence of capitalism, had ruined and deprived of property numerous small producers, viz. peasants and handicraftsmen.

EXTRA-ECONOMIC COERCION—forcible compulsion of slave or serf to work.

F

FACT—a real, non-fictitious event; knowledge whose authenticity has been proven.

FACTION—in a political party, a section whose members have their own views and struggle against the party, but remain in its ranks.

FACTORY—an enterprise manufacturing chiefly light and food industry products by means of machinery.

FACTORY OWNER—capitalist owning a factory, a capitalist enterprise.

FANATICISM—ardent devotion to one's convictions and extreme intolerance of others' views and aspirations.

FASCISM—a political trend expressing the interests of the most reactionary and aggressive circles of the imperialist bourgeoisie. Involves open terrorist dictatorship, elimination of democratic freedoms, and propagation of violence and chauvinism; advocates aggressive policies and extreme hostility towards communism.

FATALISM—belief in the inevitability of fate; predestination.

FEDERATION—a form of state system, under which the federal units (republics, states, etc.) incorporated in a union state possess certain legal and political independence. A socialist federation is formed on a national-territorial basis as a result of free self-determination of nations and voluntary unification of equal social republics (for example, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics).

FEUDAL LORD—under feudalism, a landowner who exploited peasants dependent on him.

FEUDALISM—a class-antagonistic social system, under which landowners (feudal lords) forcibly made peasants work for them. The peasants engaged in farming on land belonging to the feudal lords.

FICTION—class of literature involving works of imaginative narration (prose).

FINANCE CAPITAL—under imperialism, the dominant type of capital formed through fusion of industrial and banking monopolies (unions of big capitalists).

FIXED CAPITAL—a portion of capital in the form of the means of production whose value remains constant when making useful things out of them.

FOOD PROGRAMME OF THE USSR—a component part of the USSR state plan of economic and social development when it is planned to reliably provide the population with all kinds of high-quality food products and improve the nutrition structure.

FORM OF VALUE—value of a given commodity expressed in other commodities. For example, the market value of one sheep may be expressed in the value of other commodities, e.g., 20 sacks of grain, 10 axes, etc.

FORMAL LOGIC—the science of the laws of correct thinking; studies the forms and means of thought that should be used in any scientific cognition.

FORMALISM—strict adherence to prescribed forms.

FORMS OF SOCIALIST PROPERTY IN THE USSR—state (national) and collective farm-and-co-operative ownership of the means of production and

products of collective labour, and also ownership by public organisations (trade unions, sports and other associations) of their property.

FREE COMPETITION—unrestricted rivalry of capitalists in pursuit of maximum income (profit).

FREEDOM—ability to act in conformity with one's interests and objectives leaning on objective necessity. The measure of human freedom is determined by how well one knows natural and social laws, and also by the existing social and political system.

FUND—money or material things designed for a specific purpose, e.g., for expanding production.

G

GENERAL CRISIS OF CAPITALISM—period of revolutionary collapse of capitalism as a social system characterised by internal disintegration and decay of the world capitalist system, more vigorous struggle of international working class and national liberation movement, and transition of mankind to socialism.

GENESIS—origin; formation and establishment of something.

GEOLOGY—a science of the composition, structure, and history of development of the Earth's crust and more abyssal layers; a science on the distribution of minerals.

GEOMETRY—a branch of mathematics which deals with the spatial relationships and forms (triangles, circles, etc.).

GNOSEOLOGY—theory of cognition which reveals human ability to cognise reality and learn the truth.

GOTHA PROGRAMME—programme of German Social-Democrats adopted in 1875 in Gotha (Germany). In backing the idea of emancipating the working class and creating a socialist society, the programme nonetheless bypassed the question of a socialist revolution, assuming that the working class could achieve its objectives through universal suffrage and establishment of production co-operatives. The Gotha Programme was criticised by Karl Marx.

GROUP "A" IN INDUSTRY—industrial production of the means of production (coal, lorries, etc.).

GROUP "B" IN INDUSTRY—industrial production of items of personal consumption (food, clothes, etc.).

GUARD—1. crack, best military units; 2. in France (1789-1871), armed home guard or militia; in March 1871, the National Guard Central Committee led a popular uprising which ended in the proclamation of the Paris Commune.

H

HANDICRAFTSMAN—a worker who manually and by simple implements makes some industrial product.

HEAVY INDUSTRY—a section of industrial production engaged in manufacturing the means of production (mining raw materials, manufacturing machines and equipment, etc.).

HEGEMONISM—a policy based on the desire to dominate over other countries and peoples; directly opposite to equality of states.

INTERNATIONAL DIVISION OF LABOUR—territorial distribution of manufacture of various kinds of products between countries which specialise in making specific items.

INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL ORGANISATIONS—inter-state organisations which regulate monetary relations between countries and grant them loans.

INTERNATIONALISM—world outlook asserting the equality and equal rights of all peoples irrespective of nationality or race. It demands unity of action and solidarity of all countries in their struggle against exploitation, oppression, and economic and social injustice.

INTERVENTION—forcible interference of one or several states in the internal affairs of another state (in order to change its social and political system and for other purposes).

IRRATIONAL—inaccessible to understanding by the mind.

ISLAM—a world religion which emerged in the 7th century A.D. in Arabia. Its founder is Mohammed, who proclaimed himself the messenger of Allah (God). The Islamic faith is expounded in the Koran.

I

JESUIT—a member of the clerical regular of the Society of Jesus order which fought for consolidation of Catholicism and against popular heresies, against science and social progress.

JOINT-STOCK COMPANY—big company or association organised through funds obtained from selling securities (shares).

JUNKER—in former Prussia, a landowning nobleman, a landlord.

K

KNIGHT—in medieval Western Europe, a representative of petty feudal lords.

KOMSOMOL—the Leninist Young Communist League of the Soviet Union (YCL), a mass public organisation of progressive Soviet youth which helps the CPSU educate the growing generation in the spirit of communism and draw it into practical construction of a new society.

KULAKS—Russian name for rural bourgeoisie.

L

LABOUR—purposeful human activity, in the course of which man by means of implements of labour influences nature to adapt its phenomena for satisfying his requirements.

LABOUR CONSCRIPTION IN THE USSR—till the short-term duty to fulfil in exceptional cases socially necessary work. In the first years after the socialist revolution in Russia, was chiefly used as a means for involving representatives of overthrown exploiter classes in labour process.

LABOUR POWER—human capacity to work.

LABOUR INCENTIVE—stimulus to work based on material remuneration (wages, bonuses and various material benefits) to be received by the worker.

LABOUR PRODUCTIVITY—worker's output within a definite period of time (hour, day, month, year).

LABOUR RENT—subservient work of serfs on land belonging to a feudal lord to increase his incomes.

LABOUR THEORY OF VALUE—a teaching under which commodity value is created by the labour of the commodity producer.

LANDLORD—feudal landowner in Russia from the late 15th to the early 20th centuries. The 1917 October Revolution eliminated landlords and their ownership of land.

LASSALLE'S DOCTRINE—a variety of opportunism in the working-class movement. Named after Ferdinand Lassalle, a figure in the German working-class movement, who believed that only a struggle for universal suffrage would permit to free workers from exploitation and that the capitalist state is allegedly capable of transforming capitalist into socialist society.

LAW—1. essential, substantial, stable, recurring relationship between natural and social phenomena that are independent of the will and consciousness of people; such laws are studied by the natural and social sciences; 2. normative enactment by supreme body of state authority of some statute that has indisputable power in formulating rules of human behaviour. 3. a totality of generally obligatory rules of behaviour established by the state and protected by its authority.

LAW OF UNIFORM PROPORTIONAL DEVELOPMENT—economic law of socialism which expresses the need for co-ordinated and planned development of the whole economy. The plan for national economic development shall maintain proportions between various sectors of production to meet the requirements of society.

LAW OF VALUE—economic law of commodity production according to which the market value (market price) of commodities corresponds, as a rule, to the socially necessary (average) expenditure of labour on manufacturing them.

"LEFT-WING" COMMUNISTS—a section of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks), which came out against the entire party to express the sentiments of the petty bourgeoisie; "Left-wing" Communists rejected the possibility of socialism triumphing in one country, were against discipline and one-man management at enterprises, against the use of bourgeois specialists, and against state capitalism.

"LEFT-WING" OPPORTUNISM—a petty-bourgeois policy and ideology alien to Marxism. It asserts the omnipotence of "revolutionary violence" and pushes the working-class movement towards political adventures and useless sacrifices to weaken and subvert it.

"LEGAL MARXISM"—a bourgeois-liberal trend which appeared in the mid-1890s in Russia; its representatives published works which under the guise of Marxism advocated the need for the workers to give up their class struggle and the idea of a socialist revolution.

LENA GOLD MINES—gold fields on the Lena River in Russia, where the troops of the Russian tsar cruelly dealt with the miners who worked and lived in very bad, unbearable conditions, and came out against their ruthless exploitation by Russian and British capitalists.

LENINISM (named after its founder V. I. Lenin)—a new stage in Marxism, the Marxism of the era of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, the era of the collapse of colonialism and the victory of national liberation movements, the era of mankind's transition from capitalism to communism.

LIBERALISM—bourgeois political and ideological trend uniting advocates of the bourgeois parliamentary system, bourgeois freedoms, and free capitalist enterprise.

LOAN INTEREST—the portion of surplus value which the industrial capitalist transfers to the banking capitalist as payment for using a loan.

LUMPEN PROLETARIAT—in exploiter society, declassed elements (tramps, beggars, criminals, etc.).

M

MACHISM—a subjective idealistic trend in the philosophy of the late 19th and early 20th centuries; same as empirio-criticism; was founded by Mach and Avenarius.

MANIFESTO—a public declaration by political parties or public organisations which has important programme significance.

MANUFACTORY—a period in the development of capitalist industry (in Western Europe in the 16th-18th centuries) and a type of capitalist enterprise based on division of labour (into separate techniques) and manual handicraft technology.

MARTYROLOGY—a history or register of martyrs.

MARXISM (named after its founder Karl Marx)—scientific international ideology of the working class; a genuinely scientific world outlook which emerged in the 1840s as a direct manifestation of the fundamental interests of the most revolutionary class, the proletariat. Marxism includes three inseparable component elements, viz. dialectical and historical materialism, political economy, and scientific communism. It is a teaching on the basic laws of natural and social development, on the laws of the revolutionary struggle of the working class for the overthrow of capitalism, and on the victory of socialism and construction of a communist society.

MATERIAL AND TECHNICAL BASE OF COMMUNISM—large-scale comprehensively mechanised and automated production with the means of production in the hands of the whole people, at the highest phase of communism ensuring complete welfare and free and all-round development of all members of society.

MATERIALISM—philosophical trend proceeding from the fact that the world is material and exists objectively outside and independent of the mind; that matter is primary and consciousness is a material property that is secondary to or derivative of matter.

MATTER—reality or nature which exists independent of people's consciousness and is reflected in their senses and thoughts.

MATURE SOCIALISM—see DEVELOPED SOCIALISM.

MEANS OF LABOUR—machines and equipment with which people cultivate soil, and exert influence on nature in order to obtain means of subsistence.

MEANS OF PRODUCTION—totality of means and items used by people in the course of producing material wealth (instruments, machines, seeds, fuel, and so on).

MECHANICAL (MECHANISTICAL) MATERIALISM—a trend in materialist philosophy recognising mechanical motion of natural bodies the chief and sole determinant of all existing phenomena. It reduces a complex subject to its components, and higher and diverse forms of motion to its simple forms (e.g., the laws of social development to biological processes, etc.).

MENSHEVIKS—advocates of Menshevism, the main reformist petty-bourgeois trend in Russian Social-Democracy; a variety of international opportunism.

METAPHYSICS—the method of thought opposite to dialectics; it regards all real phenomena separately, in the state of rest, not in their interconnection and interdependence, and denies that internal contradictions are a source of development.

METHOD—in philosophy, a way of cognition, of studying natural and social phenomena; in Marxist-Leninist philosophy, dialectical materialism.

METHODOLOGY—a teaching on scientific cognition of reality.

MIDDLE AGES—period in world history which followed ancient history (collapse of the slave-owning Roman Empire in the 5th century) and preceded modern history, which started with the bourgeois English Revolution of 1688-1689.

MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX—a close-knit alliance of capitalist arms-manufacturing monopolies, the military, and the government in the United States and other imperialist states. This alliance boosts US military might for their own enrichment and world domination.

MILITIA—in the USSR, a state body for protecting public order, socialist property, and the rights and legitimate interests of citizens; also fights crime.

MODE OF PRODUCTION—unity of productive forces (means of production and workers) and corresponding production relations, e.g., capitalist mode of production, socialist mode of production.

MODERN HISTORY—the era in human history that began with the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia in 1917.

MONEY—special commodity (gold) with which the value of all goods is measured.

MONEY CIRCULATION—exchange of goods for goods by means of money.

MONOGAMY—marriage only with one person at a time.

MONOPOLY—an association of big capitalists that concentrates a major portion of production and sale of certain commodity. A monopoly establishes its dominance in some specific sector of the economy to obtain the highest possible profit (income) by cruelly exploiting the working people in developed capitalist countries and oppressing and robbing the peoples of economically backward states.

MONOPOLY CAPITALISM—highest and last stage of capitalist development (imperialism), when monopolies, or associations of capitalists, have seized dominant positions in the economy and in politics.

MONOPOLY OF LAND AS PRIVATE PROPERTY—owner's exclusive right to possess, use and manage land that belongs to him.

MONOTHEISM—a religion that recognises only one god.

MORAL LABOUR INCENTIVES—under socialism, ways for increasing people's labour activity by publicly acknowledging their services in labour (by decorating them with orders, awarding them diplomas, etc.).

MORALS—ethics; a totality of rules and norms of human behaviour in relation to other people and society as a whole.

MORTGAGE—a conveyance of property (land, buildings) to a creditor as security for acquiring loans.

MOTION—universal means of existence¹ of matter (nature); generally speaking, variation, interaction.

MUNICIPAL DUMA—executive body of municipal administration in Russia.

MYSTICISM—an idealistic world outlook based on the belief in the supernatural, mysterious, divine, admitting the possibility of direct communication of man with the other world.

MYTHOLOGY—1. a totality of myths or legends reflecting people's fantastic ideas in pre-class and early-class society about the origin of the world, natural phenomena, and gods and legendary heroes; 2. a science that studies myths and legends. i.e., their origin, contents, and dissemination.

N

NATION—a historical community of people characterised by common territory, economic life, language, and certain psychological and spiritual traits manifested in originality of culture.

NATIONAL ASSEMBLY—in France and many other countries, the name of parliament or of one of its houses.

NATIONAL LIBERATION STRUGGLE—resolute actions by oppressed peoples for doing away with foreign domination and for winning their national independence and creating their own national states.

NATIONAL QUESTION—the totality of political, economic, territorial, legal, ideological and cultural relations between nations, national groups and nationalities in various socio-economic structures. Arises in the course of the struggle of nations and peoples for their national liberation and for most favourable conditions of their social development. Under socialism, embraces the relations between nations and nationalities when they establish a voluntary union to promote friendship, strengthen their unity and secure all-round rapprochement on the basis of equality.

NATIONALISATION—transition from private ownership to state ownership of land, industrial enterprises, banks, transport, etc.

NATIONALISM—1. in imperialist states, a reactionary bourgeois or petty-bourgeois ideology and policy advocating national exclusiveness and national superiority of any nation; leads to strife among nations, to setting them against one another, and is fraught with imperialist wars and division of the working people; 2. nationalism of oppressed nations includes both generally democratic elements and reactionary elements: in some developing countries, in the course of their struggle for political and economic independence and against imperialism, nationalism is the ideology and policy

of the national liberation movement, one which, especially in its initial stages, reflects the popular protest against imperialist oppression; in the liberated countries that have taken the capitalist road of development, the ideology and policy of the sections of their national bourgeoisie, which seek to make their selfish interests pass for common national interests, closely merge with those of the reactionary circles of imperialist states.

NATIONALIST-DEVIATORS—advocates of bourgeois nationalism.

NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organisation)—a military-political alliance of capitalist countries (the US, Great Britain, Italy, Canada, etc.). NATO pursues a policy aimed at boosting its military might and preparing for war, a policy directed against socialist countries, national liberation movements and anti-imperialist actions by working people inside the NATO member-countries.

NATURAL RENT—feudal lord's income in kind, i.e., the produce reaped by the serf and given by the latter to the former gratuitously.

NATURE—1. in the broad sense, the entire world in all its diverse forms called "matter" in philosophy; 2. in a narrower sense, that which is studied by natural science.

NATURE PHILOSOPHY—the philosophy of nature; a speculative interpretation of nature, which is regarded as an integral whole.

NECESSARY WORKING TIME—under capitalism, a part of working day during which the worker creates the value of the means of subsistence for himself and his family.

NECESSARY LABOUR—under capitalism, the labour expended by the wage worker to create means of subsistence for himself and his family.

NEGATION OF THE NEGATION—major law of dialectics expressing the direction, form and results of any development; according to this law, the development of any phenomenon in nature and society takes place through the birth and maturation of something new and negation (removal, elimination) of the old, and at the same time through borrowing everything valuable from the previous state of that phenomenon. This results in continuity in the development of a given phenomenon, which passes to a new, higher stage of progress.

NEO-COLONIALISM—a policy pursued by imperialist states to preserve or restore (in new form) their economic, political and ideological domination in Asian, African, and Latin American developing countries.

NEO-FASCISM—a concept combining present-day right-wing, most reactionary movements in capitalist countries, which politically and ideologically are successors to fascist organisations disbanded after World War II.

, **NEO-KANTIANS**—followers of neo-Kantianism, a trend in the late 19th century-early 20th century philosophy which sought to revive Kant's philosophy by remaking it in the spirit of consistent idealism.

NEW ECONOMIC POLICY (NEP)—a policy pursued since 1921 in the USSR by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet state during transitional period from capitalism to socialism. Was reckoned on creating the foundations of socialist economy, developing large-scale industry, consolidating the alliance of the working class and the peasantry, and ousting and eliminating the capitalist economy to ensure the triumph of socialism. To that end, private capital was temporarily admitted to the economy; at the same time, co-operatives in industry and trade were